UNITAS

Ecclesia "Clamat ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."—St. Augustine

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Unitas Association English Language Edition

Vol. X AUTUMN, 1958 No. 3

CHARLES BOYER, S. J.

Let Unity Remain the Objective!
Mary, the Hope of Christian Unity

ROGER MATZERATH, S. A.

Conservative Judaism in the United States

SR. MARY REGINA JAZWINSKA

Cardinal Newman and Devotion to Our Lady

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

Pope Pius XII and Non-Catholics - a Summary
The Lambeth Conference, 1958 — an Evaluation by Joseph Gill, S. J. A Presbyterian View of South America — a Comment by Bernard Leeming, S. J.

ECUMENISM AND REUNION — AROUND THE WORLD

BOOK REVIEWS

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS, PEEKSKILL, NEW YORK

UNITAS

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW
ORGAN OF THE UNITAS ASSOCIATION

ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDITION

Published by the *Unitas Association* of Rome. Edited by Charles Boyer, S. J., Professor of Patristic Theology, Gregorian Pontifical University, Rome, and Rector of the College of St. Robert Bellarmine.

With Ecclesiastical Approval

Inquiries concerning the work of the *Unitas Association*, and manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor:

Rev. Fr. Charles Boyer, S.J.
UNITAS
Piazza Farnese 96, Rome, Italy.

Communications and inquiries concerning the English Language Edition should be addressed to the Secretary;

Rev. Fr. Germanus Tomaino, S.A.
UNITAS
Piazza Farnese 96, Rome, Italy.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

Subscriptions for Italy - 900 Lire (Seminarians 700 Lire)
Subscriptions for the United States and Canada should be addressed to:

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS
Peekskill, New York, U.S.A.

Single Copy — 50 cents . . . Annual Subscriptions $ 2.00
Subscriptions for Great Britain and Ireland should be addressed to:

DUCKETT
The Catholic Book Centre
140, Strand
London. W.C. 2, England

Single Copy — 4 shillings . . . Annual Subscription — 15 shillings

UNITAS

Ecclesia "Clamat ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."—St. Augustine

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Unitas Association English Language Edition

Vol. X AUTUMN, 1958 No. 3

CHARLES BOYER, S. J.

Let Unity Remain the Objective!

Mary, the Hope of Christian Unity

ROGER MATZERATH, S. A.

Conservative Judaism in the United States

SR. MARY REGINA JAZWINSKA

Cardinal Newman and Devotion to Our Lady

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

Pope Pius XII and Non-Catholics - a Summary

The Lambeth Conference, 1958 — an Evaluation by Joseph Gill, S. J. A Presbyterian View of South America — a Comment by Bernard Leeming, S. J.

ECUMENISM AND REUNION — AROUND THE WORLD

BOOK REVIEWS

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS, PEEKSKILL, NEW YORK

Imprimatur:

† Aloysius Traglia
Arciep. Caesarien., Vicesgerens

Rome, November 25, 1958

ROME - PONTIFICAL GREGORIAN UNIVERSITY PRESS

LET UNITY REMAIN THE OBJECTIVE!

The Secretary of the World Council of Churches, Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, published an article in a recent number of the *Ecumenical Review* entitled: « The Super-Church and the Ecumenical Movement », and in this essay his intention was to dissipate the fear expressed in different quarters that the World Council was becoming a Super-Church and posing a consequent threat to the liberty of its member churches. Given the occasion, the General Secretary reiterated his conception of ecumenism and of the World Council. The importance of the subject and the authority of the spokesman are such that we feel it worthwhile to present one or the other of Dr. Visser 't Hooft's views and make a number of our own observations apropos of them.

It is necessary first of all to know just what the General Secretary means by ' Super-Church '. He defines it thus: « ... a centralised ecclesiastical institution of world-wide character which seeks to impose unity and uniformity by means of outward pressure and political influence and thus denies the New Testament conception of the Church of Christ » (1). To be sure one could conceive a Super-Church without such dark characteristics. But nothing prevents us from accepting the definition of the author — at least within the limits of his article.

Such a Super-Church, thinks Dr. Visser 't Hooft, is not simply a myth, for it has appeared several times in the course of history. Although I cannot share the viewpoint with which a Calvinist interprets certain facts, it is undeniable that there have been men in the Church who have exerted on the minds of others a pressure other than that of truth and persuasion. In consequence, celebrated protests have often made themselves heard, the significance and value of which should be individually examined. As examples, the author cites Dante and Milton, Voltaire and Goethe — and even Dostoiewski, authorities, as one can see, who are quite diverse.

But the observations of the Secretary of the World Council are not primarily on a historical plane. He wishes to convince his readers of the impossibility of taking the World Council for a

---

(1) *The Ecumenical Review*, July 1958, p. 366.

Super-Church. It has not been and can never be a Super-Church. Yet we know that the future is something beyond our knowledge:

Non! L'avenir n'est à personne,
Sire, l'avenir est à Dieu.

Let us then confine ourselves to the present: for one thing I do not know who could have thought that the World Council intended to exert force on the member churches in order to impose upon them the unity of the same faith. It is accordingly easy for Dr. Visser 't Hooft to demonstrate that the Council does nothing of the kind and that even if it wished to, it would immediately encounter the opposition of its members.

Thus, the problem is well resolved — at least if it is presented in this simple and very general form. There are, nevertheless, pertinent questions of a more delicate nature which Dr. Visser 't Hooft could scarcely avoid touching upon in his article and which we should like to bring into relief in order to give them the clearest possible answer.

Let us begin, then, with this question: A Church which imposes the same doctrine on all its members and which takes for its mission the communication of that doctrine to all men — is this a Super-Church in the sense defined by the author? Let us remark at once that such is the case with the Roman Catholic Church; one can belong to it only by accepting its doctrine, and she calls herself ' Catholic ' or universal because she was established for all men and because she strives to bring each one of them into her fold. Now it is clear that the definition given in the article in question is not at all applicable to her. First of all, one would not be right in calling her a Super-Church, for her intention is not at all to domineer others who would be subordinate to her: the other churches are *separated* churches to which she can only appeal that they cease being divided from her. Besides, over and above this she does no violence to the individual conscience. It was St. Augustine who said: « No one should be forced to believe against his will » (*Contra litteras Petiliani*, 1/e, c. 83, n. 184. P.L. 43, 315), and this truth has been repeated time and again in the Church. We readily admit that there has been the Inquisition, that there is an Index, and that there are excommunications; but — according to the degree in which the Church herself is concerned and taking into account all the circumstances — all can be sufficiently justified and often has been without compromising the principle of liberty of faith. The Church of Christ, after all, is not without authority. Like every other independent society, she must protect her members, prevent disorders, and punish the guilty. But she recognizes that the immediate norm of action is the judg-

ment of conscience. The conduct of the Church has at times been conditioned by a historical situation which warranted a particular severity, but at all times she has maintained the rights of truth and has kept the faithful from error.

It is true that serious and difficult problems are involved in such an attitude. Still it would seem that Christians should come to an understanding among themselves, at least on principles. Certainly, it cannot be a matter of indifference that a soul possess the truth or be in error, for this will necessarily affect his present conduct and can have eternal consequences. Truth desires that it be ardently sought for, passionately held, jealously defended — if necessary, even more than life itself. Comprehension and tolerance are indeed necessary, but they are not the highest values, and they do have their limits.

There are two considerations which can help to resolve the difficulties which come to mind when discussion centers upon truths imposed on one's belief. We have here, primarily, a matter of moral obligation, very similar to the obligation of avoiding evil — for example, of not calumniating one's neighbor. The individual of good will lends his submission, knowing that he would be free to withold it. The truth imposes itself by manifesting itself to the understanding, either by virtue of its own evidence or by the evidence of an authority which guarantees it, so that in matters of faith not only does one's liberty remain intact, but the intellect, too, is satisfied. It is therefore a case of believing freely and giving reasonable assent.

If one were to object that all doctrines have the same pretensions and that, consequently, if left alone will create further division, our answer must be — and this is our second consideration — that in reality, all doctrines are not on an equal plane. The doctrine of Christ occupies a place apart. Not only is it the truth, strengthened by proof, while other doctrines, according as they contradict it, are in error; but still more, it is illuminated and manifested from within by the grace of the Holy Spirit. The Church of Christ has been established to gather all men into her fold; she possesses in herself all the means necessary to accomplish that great mission, which is impeded only by our faults.

It is our task, therefore, to search out that unity which Jesus Christ willed and asked for, and to communicate to all men the fullness of His doctrine and of His grace. Doubtless, there are other duties confronting us, but they are all compatible with the former.

Therefore, if I had a fear to express, it would not be that of seeing the World Council striving to lead its member churches to

a unity of doctrine — provided, of course, that it were the genuine doctrine of Christ — but rather of seeing the Council giving itself over to other tasks which divert it from what seems to me to be its missions and its *raison d'être,* and which sometimes delay or thwart the movement towards unity. It was at the beginning of the Ecumenical Movement that Charles Brent gave expression to his intuition, or to what has been called his vision. Now he did not see in his mind's eye an institution fostering collaboration between churches which would remain diverse, but one sole Church in which differences were to disappear.

In the persuasion that the unity of Christians is in itself an incomparable benefit, that it is something possible since Christ has willed it, that the Holy Spirit is inclining the present generation in its direction, and that the Ecumenical Movement should be directed towards it, it is my sincere wish that the influence of the World Council be exercised in favor of it. This influence is far-reaching and depends on the deliberate decisions which the Council makes in one sense or the other. Speaking of the World Council, its Secretary has good reason to write: « ... it cannot be denied that through its very existence, through the statements of its Assemblies and Central Committee it exerts a real influence and develops a certain ethos » (2). The officials of such an institution must certainly experience the sense of a formidable responsibility. Whatever be their own personal convictions, they will avoid that which would render Christian unity impossible. The dramatic note of the whole question lies in the fact that this unity is possible in one way alone.

THE EDITOR

---

(2) *The Ecumenical Review,* July 1958, p. 384.

MARY, THE HOPE OF CHRISTIAN UNITY *

That Mary is in a general way the Help of Christians no Catholic can deny. In singing the *Salve Regina* we salute her as our hope, and we invoke her more and more as Mediatrix of all graces, as one who, united with her Son and through the merits of her Son, distributes the fruits won by His act of redemption. As the return to Christian unity is certainly a gift of God, which we may even call an extraordinary gift — whether because of its great price or because of the difficulties which must be overcome, it is without doubt among the benefits for which we wait on Mary. At this point the special titles of the Mother of God may be indicated, which may appropriately be invoked with our Advocate and Helper in the great work for the restoration of Christian unity. These titles have existed ever since the Church inserted into her liturgy the anthem *Gaude, Maria virgo, cunctas haereses sola interemisti in universo mundo.* « Thou alone hast overcome heresies throughout the whole world ». This means that the Blessed Virgin has conquered division in the past, and she has done so for reasons which give us a sure hope that she will give us the same victories in the future.

One must always remember that in the first instance the attitude of our separated brethren towards the Virgin Mary seems rather an additional difficulty in the quest for unity. The dissident Eastern Christians, who have preserved a deep and tender cultus of the Mother of God, refuse in fairly considerable numbers to accept the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and of the Assumption as defined by Pius IX and Pius XII, or at least they only accept these truths as theological opinions which they are not bound to hold. Anglicans are opposed to these same dogmas, and are very much more restrained in their veneration of Mary. As for the Protestants, they tend to deny or minimise the privileges of Mary, and reproach Catholics with what they call their « Mariolatry », or even idolatry. Luther wrote some magnificent passages on the greatness of Mary and her faith, but he also

---

* The text of a conference delivered at the Mariological Congress at Lourdes in September.

set out a principle which practically destroyed the whole basis of Mariology — our prayers and supplications can be addressed only to God alone. His disciples in the course of controversy have strongly maintained this negation.

We will consider in due course the difficulties which arise from differences in Mariology. But first it is fitting that we should establish positively our reasons for expressing our hope that Mary will extend the unity of the Catholic Church to include all Christians.

The first reason, it seems to us, consists in the fact that the Virgin Mary on the one hand represents in her person and in her privileges a whole synthesis of Catholic doctrine, and on the other she represents it in the most attractive and lovable way.

Mary sums up all our faith. In the Gospel she appears as the Mother of Jesus, the Messiah promised by the Prophets, who is come to deliver His people and all the nations from their sins. Now the same Jesus who as man is the Son of Mary, is the Son of the Highest, the Eternal Son of God the Father, possessing the same divinity as the Father, and is True God. If the Son of Mary is God, Mary is the Mother of God, the Mother of the Son of God. There is then in God a Father and a Son. We cannot know who Mary is without believing in the Trinity, in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, which by its operation in Mary permitted the virginal conception. So, antecedent knowledge of the first Christian mystery, which is the mystery of the Trinity, is necessary in order to understand how the second mystery, the Incarnation of the Word, could come about. But the Word was made flesh, as we affirm in our creed, for us men and for our salvation. Here is the third great mystery, that of the Redemption called forth by the name of Mary. All Christians, at least all who believe in the divinity of Christ, are in agreement up to this point. But they are not agreed on what follows, though for the moment we are explaining who Mary really is, and not what dissidents think she is. For the honour of her Son she was endowed with the privilege of her Immaculate Conception. She reminds us also of original sin, with which all men are tainted with the exception of herself. At the same time she is placed in an order apart; with her Son she triumphs over Satan not only in her conception but also at Calvary, where united with the crucified one she sorrowfully offers her beloved Son for the salvation of the world. She is filled with true personal holiness which places her as the highest of created beings. The virtue of the Redemption brings a new birth to the other children of Adam by water and the Holy Spirit in baptism, which according to Catholic doctrine is the essence of justification

and the principle of all merit. Together with baptism another sacrament is necessary in order that we may retain that life in us — the Eucharist, the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ formed in the womb of the Blessed Virgin. But one must think in Heavenly terms. Is it possible that Christ would have left that body to corruption out of which He had been born? The Mother is entire, body and soul together, close to her glorified Son. She makes us remember our own glorification when we shall be like her Son, seeing Him as He is, when we shall also rejoice in the celestial beauty of the Mother. If Bernadette could be so transformed with delight in the humble grotto of Lourdes, what will it be like to see the Immaculate in all her glory in Heaven?

Mary also makes us think of the Church. In the 12th chapter of the Apocalypse the woman with child who appears in such glory is, to the eye of faith, both the Church and the Virgin. St. Augustine says of the one and the other that they both engender the faithful by their love. The Church in her beginnings was like a cell grouped about the Mother of Jesus, and nourished its fervour by contemplating her. Today Mary speaks to us also of the Pope. It was like a stirring dialogue between her and Pope Pius IX. On December 8, 1854, the successor of Peter in a definition proclaimed amidst all the splendours of the Vatican Basilica, said to Mary, « Thou art immaculate ». And four years later, on March 25 1858, in calling herself the Immaculate Conception, Mary said to the Pope, « And you are infallible ». Whosoever confesses the Immaculate Conception of Mary as defined by Pope Pius IX, and her Assumption defined by Pius XII, keeps to the doctrine of the Church about the Pope, his supremacy and his infallibility. The devotion given to Mary shows forth the will of God to be interceded with by the saints, and especially by His Mother. And lastly, the miracles worked by Mary confirm the doctrine of the Church on the means which God employs to guarantee His revelation, and on the eternal efficacy of Catholic doctrine.

Knowledge of Mary therefore implies in some way a knowledge of the principle truths of our faith, so that we can say to our separated brethren, to the extent that you come to know the Virgin Mary better, the closer you will come to the Catholic Church.

On the other hand, the truths concerning Mary, far from being hard to believe, follow naturally from the truths which the Scriptures tell of her in the most explicit manner. Is it not enough that she is the Mother of the Son of the Most High, the Mother of the Word, the Mother of God? Protestants from John Calvin to Karl Barth exalt the divine transcendence. They do not exaggerate it if they are satisfied with proclaiming the greatness of

God, and affirming with St. Augustine and St. Thomas that the better one knows God, the better one understands how little we know Him. It is always an exaggeration, however, or rather a contradiction, to confuse the imperfection of our knowledge with the absence of knowledge. One would not say that God is infinitely great if one had not some concept of His greatness. The invisible perfections of God, St. Paul tells us, are made intelligible to us by His creation. But we cannot here consider the inconsistency of our opponents, but must satisfy ourselves with their conviction, which is also our own, that God is great beyond anything we can explain or even contemplate. But the more they insist on the greatness of God, the more ought they to understand the greatness of His Mother, for the greater is God, the greater naturally is His Mother. One must arrive at St. Thomas's insight, and see something of infinity in the dignity of the Mother of God simply because of the infinity of God (1).

One can understand the intuition of St. Augustine who, constrained to prove to Pelagius that all men are sinners, stopped to make an exception of the Virgin Mary, and that, he said, was for the honour of her Son, *propter honorem Domini.* Far from belittling the Son, one honours Him in honouring the Mother. Mary's beauty is derivative, it is a grace which praises the giver, it is like the reflected beauty of the moon, *pulchra ut luna.* If the silvery brightness of that body delights us, we know that it comes from the sun. When one thinks of the title 'Mother of God', and bears in mind that privileged creature who actually had the intimate relationship of motherhood with God, to the extent that God willed to have in His human nature the dependence of an infant on its mother, one cannot feel inclined to belittle this Mother of God or minimise all that concerns her, but on the contrary one would expect to see her filled with divine attentions and singular gifts. And when the authority of the Church proclaims her incomparable sanctity, her Immaculate Conception, her perpetual virginity, her co-operation in the work of her Son, her preservation from the corruption of the grave, then one is satisfied in intellect as in heart, as were the people of Ephesus when Mary was proclaimed the *Theotokos,* as was the Catholic world when Pius IX pronounced the bull *Ineffabilis,* as was the vast crowd which heard Pope Pius XII in St. Peter's Square on November 1, 1950, when he defined the Assumption of Mary.

The divine bounty delights in adorning Mary, no doubt for her own sake, but also to attract souls that hunger for purity, beauty, and love. Certainly it is not correct to present Our Lord

(1) I, q. 25, a. 6, ad 4.

as a severe judge, with Mary as all tenderness and mercy. Jesus who is Himself all perfection, who loved us and laid down His life for us on the cross, and who throughout the entire Gospel is recorded as gracious and merciful, exerts a sovereign influence on souls. But he wished his most lovable Mother to be at His side, and His providence often uses her to win the hearts of men. Here is a curious example of this, only one among many. A Swiss journalist, René Leyvraz, who was born a Protestant but had lost all his faith, wrote a hymn personifying the Revolution. It includes the following lines:

> O fruitful Virgin
> With pure countenance and fair regard,
> Come, save the world!

But then he considered another Virgin, truly pure of countenance. Emotion carried him away, and he felt himself conquered. The *Ave Maria* moved him greatly, the *Salve Regina* inspired him, and soon he became a Catholic, at the service of Mary and the Church (2). Again in this instance, Mary not only summarised Catholic truth, but she also urged it.

All this is true of Mary, Mother of God. But she is also Mother of mankind, and under this title she cannot but have the cause of Christian unity at heart. All Christians worship Christ. The basis of the World Council obliges all members to accept Our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour, and the price of admission is belief in the three great mysteries of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Redemption. This faith constitutes a common spiritual parenthood among all Christians. If all men are brothers because all are called to share in the divine life, then even more are they brothers who confess and serve the only begotten Son, consubstantial with the Father. These brethren are indeed separated into divergent and sometimes hostile groups. Today, moreover, they accept these separations, even though they may regret them, but they are not responsible for them, and their attachment to Christ is sincere. How can the Mother of mankind not be concerned with these Christians who so love and adore her Son? And is it not likely that her concern for them will take the form of completing their faith, and of leading them to that unity from which their fathers separated themselves? She follows in the spirit of the prayer of Jesus before the Last Supper; that prayer of intercession of Christ before the Father continues to be pleaded in Heaven, that all who believe in the divinity of the Saviour may be one.

---

(2) See P. Lorson, S. J., *Notre Dame et les Conversions* in *Marie*, Paris, Beauchesne, 1949, p. 888.

The power of Mary's intercession was revealed at the wedding feast at Cana. The wine ran out, and on the mere suggestion of His Mother, « they have no wine », Jesus made it flow in abundance. The Master's words « My hour is not yet come » makes us realise that this miracle foretold the day when the whole world would receive new life through His redemptive blood. As regards our separated Protestant brethren who have lost the priesthood, and with it the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist, the gentle pleading of Mary « they have no wine » still has its appropriateness. They have no longer that wine which was poured forth when the hour of redemption sounded, which is the seed of all true heroic Christian virtues. In fact, those who claimed the title of Protestant at the Amsterdam Assembly neither possessed nor thought it necessary to possess a priesthood deriving from the Apostles through an uninterrupted succession. Even though they may, like the Lutherans, admit of a real presence of the Body of Christ along with the bread of the Eucharist, even though they may admit of a moral presence like the Calvinists, neither the one nor the other have the true priesthood, nor consequently the true Eucharist. *Vinum non habent.* They have the wine of the material vine, but not that of the true Vine which is Christ. Anglicans on the other hand recognise the necessity of the apostolic succession and believe themselves to possess it. But Pope Leo XIII in the Apostolic Letter of September 15, 1896, *Apostolicae Curae,* authoritatively asserted the traditional view according to which Anglicans broke the apostolic succession, and therefore their orders are invalid. Although it is painful for us to say so, they too *vinum non habent.* We all hope that Mary will again re-enact the scene at Cana, and that in God's good time, which it perhaps depends on ourselves to advance, the same miracle will come to pass.

On the cross Jesus said to His Mother, referring to St. John, « Behold thy son ». And then He said to John, « Son, behold thy Mother ». An interpretation is becoming more and more customary, found as early as in a text of Origen, which interprets the thought of the Evangelist in making the Beloved Disciple the representative of the human race, so that Jesus in these words declares Mary to be Mother of us all. Now surely it is the mission of a mother to create, uphold, and increase unity among all her children. Just as the Catholic finds it natural to ask Mary for a higher measure of charity, unity, and obedience within the Church, so also it seems clear that they should ask from her the grace of receiving the rest of mankind into their unity, and above all those who, being Christians, are already nearest to it.

One can often trace in history the unfolding of this activity of the Virgin which we have described — each time a heresy has been vanquished or progress towards unity accomplished. Nestorianism was a fundamental error which was incompatible with faith in Christ and in His divinity. How was it condemned? When the matter was considered in reference to Mary the truth became clear. Mary, according to Nestorius, was undoubtedly the Mother of Jesus and the Mother of Christ, but not the Mother of God. But that could be true only if Jesus were not at the same time the Son of God but another person — if he were not God. This was the only possible meaning, that Jesus is the same person as the Son of God, and that Mary is the Mother of God. In the struggle for the sacred images the great support of orthodoxy was the love of the people for icons of Mary. It is known that in the difficult mission of St. Dominic against the Albigensian heresy the Christian victory lay in the beginnings of the rosary. Various special feasts recall the help which Mary gave in the resistance of Christianity against Islam, as at Lepanto and Vienna. And the apparitions of Mary at La Salette, Lourdes, and Fatima, are they not a powerful remedy against the unbelief and paganism of these later centuries?

Mary and Our Separated Brethren

Let us turn now to the consideration of what the person of Mary really is in the religion of our separated brethren, and see if she is an obstacle or a help towards unity.

We can say at once that in the East there are two sources of hope which cannot but lend us encouragement. One is the cultus of the Eucharist; the other is the devotion to the Mother of God. The Eucharist, sacrament of unity, serves by its very nature as a pointer towards reunion. The devotion to Mary penetrates into Eucharistic worship and fills it with profound religious sentiments. Mary is honoured no less by the dissident Eastern Christians than by Catholics. Before the Bolshevik whirlwind there were to be found innumerable churches and celebrated icons. In fairly recent times more than a hundred and twenty churches and monasteries under the patronage of Mary have been discovered in ancient Byzantium, now Istanbul ([3]). And here is another example of this tender Marian piety from which springs the deepest fun-

---

([3]) R. Janin, *La Géographie Ecclésiastique de l'Empire Byzantin,* Vol. III. Paris, 1953, p. 5. Quoted by M. Gordillo in *Unitas,* 4 (1955), 148.

damentals of the faith; it is a *theotokion* for vespers on Easter Monday: — « How should we not be amazed in the presence of thy childbearing, at once human and divine, All Blessed One? Without knowledge of man, Immaculate One, thou didst bring forth into the world the Son who had no father after the flesh, and who is begotten of the Father without mother before all ages, having suffered no change, no confusion nor division, but having preserved whole and entire the properties of each of the two natures. Therefore, our Lady and Virgin Mother, pray that He will save the souls of those who hymn thee with the true faith as Mother of God » (4).

Pope Leo XIII exhorted Catholics to have recourse to Mary in order to obtain the benefits that charity would make them wish for their dissident Orthodox brethren (5). Among other reasons he gave two which are especially appropriate; one is the contribution of the East to the development of the devotion to Mary in the whole Church. What hymns, what festivals, what sermons on the glory of Mary have an Eastern origin! The other reason is no less relevant; a great number of icons and statues of the Virgin which are venerated in the West today come from the East, and so witness to the unity of faith and worship which held sway in happier times. May we ever bear in mind the conclusion of that great Pope: — « It is then a great help towards Christian unity that God gives us in Mary » (6).

Pope Pius XII has in some respects gone even further. He asks our separated Eastern brethren to unite themselves to us that we may pray to Mary and beseech her for that unity in which they and we may become one fold under one shepherd (7). He has written to the « very dear people of Russia » to exhort them to hold fast to their devotion to Mary, and to consecrate themselves to the Immaculate Heart of the Mother of God (8).

Let us now face the difficulty which we mentioned earlier. However great their devotion to Mary, the dissident Orthodox do not accept the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption. It need not surprise us that they have not accepted them on the Pope's word, because they do not admit the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff. But one cannot concede that they

---

(4) E. Mercenier, *La Prière des Eglises du Rite Byzantin.* II. *Les Fêtes.* Chevetogne, 1948, p. 297.

(5) Enc. *Adiutricem Populi Christiani,* 5 September 1895, A.S.S. vol. 28, p. 129 *et seq.*

(6) « *Itaque per magnum unitatis christianae praesidium divinitus oblatum est in Maria* ». *ibid.*

(7) Enc. *Fulgens Corona,* 8 September 1953, A.A.S. 45 (1953) p. 590.

(8) Apostolic Letter *Carissimi Russiae Populi,* A.A.S. 49 (1952) p. 505.

really repudiate the doctrines themselves. It is true that in recent times certain of them have repudiated these doctrines just because the Pope has proclaimed them, so strong is their tendency to go against Catholics. Immediately after the definition of the Assumption certain theologians of Athens attacked what they called the « new dogma », which should, they said, have remained in the realm of theological speculation. Denials of the Immaculate Conception are even older and more frequent.

But this opposition, which is by no means universal, is relatively recent. The influence of the East was once very important in the doctrinal development which brought these truths to the full knowledge of the faithful. Even after the schism, Byzantines and Slavs have been unanimous in proclaiming them throughout the centuries. The Assumption is rarely controverted, even today. As for the Immaculate Conception, it was in the 16th and 17th centuries that doubts appeared, largely through the contamination of Protestant negations. The separation naturally led to opposition to the decrees of Rome.

Some would delay the exemption of Mary from the taint of original sin until the moment of the Annunciation, or the Redemption, or even Pentecost. But in arriving at these conclusions they have modified in that respect the concept of original sin, so that one may ask if their opposition to the Immaculate Conception of Mary is not a matter of words rather than of doctrine. One must also remember that since the schism the dissident Eastern Churches realise that they are incapable of making definitions. Any doctrinal opposition born since the separation cannot be held as definitive. To sum up, one may follow the declaration of a contemporary Russian theologian: — « Between Catholics and ourselves there is only one question — that of Papal supremacy ». In fact, if the Roman Primacy were to be accepted, the whole East would adhere with great joy to the Marian truths defined by the Popes.

On the Protestant side the situation is more complicated. There are Anglicans who have the same devotion to the Virgin that Catholics have. They recite the rosary, organise pilgrimages, and celebrate Mary's privileges. Many others have in their hearts a veneration and love for the Blessed Virgin, and show it by some indication or other. For instance, Newman while still a Protestant placed in his brother's room an image of her whom all generations call blessed. Few if any are they who have no feelings of admiration and respect for Mary, even though they deny any semblance of a cultus.

It is true, however, that many Protestants, among them the French Reformed (but not all, and particularly not the valiant Calvinist community of Taizé) are actually hostile to the Catholic devotion to Mary. They talk of the deification of the Virgin, of idolatry, of a Christ-substitute, and at the least, of unseemly excesses. And indeed excesses are possible, especially in outward appearances. But they are rarer than Protestants say they are, and rarer than even some Catholics are willing to concede. Once it is well established that Mary is only a creature, and that all she has is through grace (and what Catholic does not know and remember this?) it is difficult to exaggerate the veneration, the praise, the supplications, which one addresses to so pure a Virgin, so great a Queen, and so wondrous a Mother.

To reach the heart of the matter, the true reason for Protestant opposition is not this 'deification' of which they speak and which they know does not exist, but rather it is that in reference to Mary they cannot maintain the Lutheran doctrine of extrinsic justification, solely imputed, which leaves us as sinners — each and all. For them Mary must also be a sinner. « Saint and sinner », they say (9). But that is a contradiction, and they ought indeed to call her saint alone, like Catholics. That would sweep away every difficulty, and such is our hope.

Moreover, we are all the more moved to pray to God as we realise the frailty of the means which are within our capacity. When it is a matter of bringing back the Orthodox, and of forging a union more durable and realistic than that which was proclaimed at Florence, the difficulties and resistances are such that the task seems beyond human possibility. One feels that the difficulties are even greater in the face of the multiplicities of Protestantism, in which so many negations are obstinately upheld. Undoubtedly a new and hopeful spirit is moving the Christian world. Organizations have been set up, discussions have taken place and continued, and some positions have improved. This is already an undoubted answer to prayer. But the end is still far off. The movement must be continued, it must avoid being side-tracked, it must advance towards the ideal which it has set before it despite all obstacles, and that ideal is the unity willed by Christ, the unity which we believe in with all our faith, the unity of the Holy Roman Catholic Church.

We could not terminate better than by giving two invocations to the Virgin, one by Pope Pius XII, who has constantly dealt with the question of Christian unity, and the other by Leo XIII,

---

(9) See *Réforme*, 26 July, 1958, p. 6.

which marks the beginning of the actual movement for Christian unity.

Pius XII thought of the Eastern Christians, and said to Mary: — « To the peoples separated by error and by discord, and particularly to those who profess for you a singular devotion among whom scarcely a house can be found that does not honour thy venerable icon (today perhaps hidden and preserved for happier days), give peace, and lead them back to the one fold of Christ, under the one and true shepherd » (10).

Leo XIII thought also of the East when he sent the following words to the Marian Congress at Livorno in 1895. Their appeal is still unlimited: —

> Una Fides Christi, Pastor regat unus ovile
> Dispersas gentes colligat unus amor
> Virgo, fave: errantes ah! lumine mater amico
> Respice, et Unigenae iunge benignatus.

« The faith of Christ is one, when one shepherd governs the flock, when one love gathers together the scattered nations. O Virgin, be propitious, gaze down with kindly eye upon the wanderers, and deign to unite them under thine only Son » (11).

CHARLES BOYER, S. J.

---

(10) A.A.S., 34 (1942), p. 346.
(11) Cf. *Unitas*, Italian edition, I (1952), p. 36.

CONSERVATIVE JUDAISM IN THE UNITED STATES*

The third of the three accepted « branches » of Judaism in the United States is Conservatism. At the present time its 550 congregations representing approximately 200,000 families are led by 625 rabbis of the Rabbinical Assembly of America. These figures represent a history of only fifty years or so, since Conservative Judaism is the youngest of the three groups. Yet far more than Orthodoxy and even much more than Reform Judaism, it may be said to have its roots in American culture and civilization. Hence in the study of American Jewish religious life, an account of Conservatism finds particular reference.

The growth of Conservative Judaism in the United States exhibits three outstanding characteristics: first of all, it is tied to the rapid social rise and acclimation of East European Jewish immigrants into American life; secondly, in its ideological background it purports to follow « historical Judaism » as a center position between Orthodoxy and Reform; and thirdly, Conservative religious practices reflect a certain compromise and modernization. The characteristics provide a convenient outline for development.

Sociological Changes

Jewish communities in the United States stem from three groups of immigrants who came roughly in three « waves ». The first group to emigrate to America were the Sephardim. These were Jews principally from the Spanish peninsula. The second wave came during the nineteenth century from Germany or from countries where the Jews had assimilated German culture. The third and largest group came from the countries of East Europe during the years 1880 to 1914. Here we find Jews from Russia and territories ruled by Russia, from Poland, and from parts of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

(*) The last of a series of articles on American Judaism.

It is the last wave, the East European immigrant Jews, that forms the chief interest of the present study since it is from this group that Conservatism achieved its greatest growth.

After the East European Jews arrived on American shores, in general and as a group, they tended to pass through three areas of settlement in the New World as they advanced in social status. Like many other immigrants immediately upon arrival, the Jews — (unless otherwise signified, East European Jews are meant whenever the general term « Jews » is used) — settled in the poorest districts. These were the areas of first settlement and may be considered as slum areas. Here the immigrants grouped together, closely associated with members of the same European community. Here, too, they established Orthodox synagogues, endeavoring as far as they were able to carry on the traditions of the life they had led in their country of origin.

Unlike other ethnic groups of the same status, however, the Jewish community, often within the span of the first generation, left the area of first settlement and re-grouped in a second area, generally a middle-class district of apartments and small homes. In this area, as in the previous one, Orthodoxy, although somewhat loosened from its narrow, local bonds, was still the dominant form of religious Judaism.

From the area of second settlement many members of the Jewish community moved to a third area, a district characterized by a population composed of many non-Jews in the middle-class or higher. Usually this shift to the third area of settlement was made by the second generation — taken culturally if not chronologically — of the more successful immigrant families.

Here, in the third area, significant changes took place. When he entered the place of third settlement, the son of Jewish immigrants had two alternatives. Either he could continue the Orthodoxy of the second settlement or adopt the Reform Judaism of the German Jew who had arrived in the third area before him.

The second generation responded to the alternative by rejecting Orthodoxy. The move seemed to be inevitable. The first generation, that is, the immigrant, was clearly a product of the old country. Slowly, under the pressure of his business life in the new world, he gave up those practices of his religion which interfered with economic success. But he did so with some reluctance and a good deal of sadness. For him there was no other way to carry on Judaism than in the strict and traditional ways of his forefathers.

The Jew of the second generation, however, born in the United States, became a product of America. Growing up, he

attended its schools, spoke its language, and breathed its atmosphere from his youth. It was only natural when he matured that he should aspire not only to American wealth, as his father had done before him, but also, and unlike his father, to the full American way of life.

And in the American way of life, he found it difficult to fit Orthodoxy. Especially was this true after he achieved some social status and wished to climb higher. Yiddish, the « business » language of the synagogue, was looked upon as a sign of his inferior, foreign background. Orthodox dietary laws were impossible to keep in the secular, American world and among his non-Jewish friends. The Orthodox synagogue itself with its old-world and slum-area associations did not mean for him what it meant for his father. It repelled rather than attracted him. As a consequence traditional Judaism ceased to be a living culture for him. He became disaffected with Orthodoxy.

Strangely enough, however, the ways and thoughts of his youthful days in Orthodoxy, insufficient as they may have been to hold him faithful to traditional practices, were yet strong enough to prevent him from taking the other side of the alternative he found facing him when he came to the third area of settlement. He had rejected Orthodoxy as being incompatible with his American way of life. He also rejected Reform Judaism as being too far removed from the Judaism he had known. If Orthodoxy was too little adapted to his new way of life, Reform Judaism, on the other hand, was too extreme to suit him. Not finding himself at home in either alternative, he, together with many others, formed new congregations which were neither as far right as the Orthodox nor as far left as the Reform, but Conservative, that is, in a kind of middle ground between tradition and modern life.

Aspects of Conservative Thought

It is not accidental that a section on theology or, as the Conservatives prefer to call it, « ideology », be placed in a secondary position rather than have primary consideration. The fact is that the Conservative system has been achieved rather on the basis of the social and cultural adjustment in American life by Jews than through a careful working out of a detailed ideology. There are some reasons for this.

In all Judaism — Orthodox, Reform, and Conservative — there is no central authority. There are conventions of rabbis, there are alliances and associations, there are venerated individuals, but

there is no ruling body. A rabbi in a congregation is a spiritual leader and teacher rather than an executive head. If he or his rabbinical association or convention gives an « order » or a « ruling », it has only that amount of force proportionate to the moral persuasion to follow it that he or it is able to engender. Hence, no authority can strictly say to the people, you must believe this or must practice that.

On the other hand, the people, in a very literal sense, do rule the synagogue. It is they who are in control of each congregation. If they believe and practice Orthodoxy, the congregation will be Orthodox; if they want the Reform, they will call in a Reform rabbi to lead them. It is under such circumstances, by reason of their desires, conditioned through social adjustment and acceptance of American culture, that the people, rather than a particular « ideology », established Conservatism.

Yet, although it is true that the Conservative movement as such was brought about through the demand of the Jewish people for the Conservative system and ideology, it is also true that Conservatism with a system and ideology was ready at hand when the demand was made.

The first corporate body to represent American Judaism on a national scale was established in 1873. It was called the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. In 1875 a representative school was also founded, under the name of the Hebrew Union College.

Reform influences, however, quickly succeeded in gaining control over both the Union and the College to the dismay of the more traditional elements of the rabbinate. In 1885 Dr. Kaufmann Kohler, a Reform rabbi, convoked a conference of American rabbis at Pittsburgh. The conference, under pressure, accepted a number of Reform resolutions. These pronouncements, called the « Pittsburgh Platform », dealing particularly with the right to modify ceremonies, reject dietary laws, abolish all reference to sacrificial cult, and dismiss Hebrew from synagogue services, caused the traditionalists to withdraw and to consider the formation of a new alignment in American Jewry. Soon after, under the leadership of Dr. Sabato Morais, the Jewish Theological Seminary Association was founded in New York City in 1887. It is from the date of this foundation that Conservatives consider their movement to have formally begun.

The new movement, by reason of its protest against the radicalism of the Reform, came to be known as « Conservative Judaism ». However, at the beginning it was also called, « Historical Judaism »,

since it took its ideological justification from the German positive-historical school of Zechariah Frankel.

Judaism, claimed this school of thought, has always been a growing and changing religion. The corpus of tradition throughout history has considered the changing conditions affecting men's lives. Revisions in tradition, however, were always made within the framework of *Halachah* (the Law) and were predicated on the basis of the actual practice of the Jewish people. As Solomon Schechter, considered by many as the father of Conservatism, put this principle: « The norm as well as the sanction of Judaism is the practice actually in vogue. Its consecration is the consecration of general use » (1). Or, as another author declares: « ... Conservatism developed the thesis that it was not only life that could be asked to adjust to tradition. There were times when tradition could be asked to give way and to adjust to the demands of life » (2).

Conservatism, then, was ready with both a principle, if not a full-blown ideology, and also with a school for the training of a Conservative rabbinate. In 1913 an association of Conservative rabbis was founded, the United Synagogue of America. With these the Conservative movement assumed full stature along with Orthodoxy and Reform as a branch of American Jewry.

Conservative Practice

In consequence both of the Conservative principle of change based on the demands of modern life and also because of the Conservative « middle » position between Orthodoxy and Reform, religious practice in Conservatism represents a compromise. Where the line is to be drawn between observance and non-observance is a most difficult question for Conservatives. Within the movement there are therefore tendencies toward the right or stricter observance and toward the left, or more radical change. Since, however, the question of observance is ultimately settled by the practice of the people, and since the people are influenced more by modern life than by ideology, the basic characteristic of religious practice is toward flux, inconsistency, and general eclecticism. Based on factors such as convenience, personal piety, and the influences of varying environmental elements, practice may

---

(1) Quoted by Fritz A. Rothschild in « Conservative Judaism Faces the Need of Change », *Commentary*, Nov. 1953 (Vol. 16, n. 5) p. 452.

(2) Dr. Ben Zion Bokser, « Conservative Judaism in America », *Jewish Quarterly Review*, April 1955 (Vol. 45, n. 4) p. 345.

assume many varieties. One Conservative rabbi reporting on his congregants declared that less than ten per cent practiced complete observance on the one hand and about the same amount on the other disregarded all observances. The bulk of the congregation, he said, was distributed between these extremes ([3]).

Yet, despite all the variabilities of actual practice, there is a pattern of Conservative practice. In the Conservative synagogue Hebrew is used for the prayers and ceremonies, while English is employed as the common, « extra-ceremonial » language. The ceremonies themselves also exhibit the typical, middle-of-the-road, Conservative characteristic. They are revisions of the traditional ceremonies but at the same time use a good deal of the traditional texts. During the services women, contrary to Orthodox practice, are seated together with the men. Solemnity, decorum, and propriety are stressed. Conservatives try to suppress commercialism such as the holding of auctions during services for the purpose of selling honors, the competitive pledging of money, and fund raising.

To fit in with the American practice of conducting business on Saturday morning, Conservatives have introduced a somewhat abbreviated Friday night service to supplant or at least to supplement the traditional Saturday morning worship. During the Friday evening worship the sermon is in English and has an important place. Traditional music is sung, but it is often accompanied by an organ. After the service is over, the evening is concluded with a social gathering for the congregation. This has become a significant feature in the Conservative community life. It is part of the Conservative program calling for the synagogue to be a multifunctional agency catering to modern needs. In line with this thinking, recreational activities, male and female « church » organizations, and a full program of youth education through Sunday and Talmud Torah schools have been put into operation. To sum up all these functions, the Conservative synagogue is described as a *Beth Tefillah* (house of prayer), a *Beth Keneseth* (house of assembly), and a *Beth Midrash* (house of study).

Critique and Conclusion

We cannot conclude this account of Conservative Judaism without indicating some of the problems and conflicts of the move-

---

([3]) Cf. Marshall Sklare, *Conservative Judaism*, (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955), p. 70.

ment. A full scale criticism is hardly feasible here, yet even within narrower bonds several points of weakness readily appear.

Conservative Judaism is often described as the center between Orthodoxy on the one hand and Reform on the other. But this is a relative position which demands for its understanding a clear knowledge of just where the two extremes stand. To better explain the place of Conservatism, then, its proponents say that it combines the practices of tradition with the demands of life or that it both conserves and changes traditional Judaism. Again, however, this explains really nothing. It defines the problem facing Conservatism rather than solves it. How much does or should Conservatism change? How much does or should it keep? Is there a constant evolution of change or have all the changes now taken place, and from henceforth there will be no more? If change is to continue, will it stop short of changing Conservative Judaism out of existence?

The inherent double direction of change and conservation makes it very difficult to define Conservatism in positive terms. Even many rabbis of the movement are apparently in something of a quandary to give an adequate answer. It is not Orthodoxy; it is not Reform; but it is something of each. One author states succinctly: « The unresolved, recurring question at every convention (of the Rabbinical Assembly of America, the association of Conservative rabbis) was: What is Conservative Judaism? » (4).

When it comes to worship, the problem of tradition versus change becomes especially acute. Conservatives have proclaimed loudly that they have kept the traditional Hebrew texts for their services. However, they « adjust » the text in two ways. First, liturgy specialists supplement the text with English additions. These supplementary prayers have no ideas objectionable to more modern elements in the congregation. When a service is held, then, the traditional text is often glossed over by having it read or chanted in Hebrew, a language few American Jews understand, and the English text is emphasized.

Another technique is known as « re-interpretation ». In the Conservative prayer books, the Hebrew text is translated so that the congregation can follow the service. However, because the Hebrew expresses ideas not in conformity with Conservative ideology or practice, Conservative translators « redefine » or « re-interpret » traditional phrases so that they express their own convictions. The possibilities to which such a technique could lead

---

(4) Moshe Davis, « Jewish Religious Life and Institutions in America », in *The Jews: Their History, Culture, and Religion,* ed. by Louis Finkelstein, (2 Vols. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949), I, p. 430.

is easy to imagine. Some rabbis, however, have felt that they simply had to face up to the problem, and in a new edition of the Conservative prayer book a few revisions of the Hebrew text were made.

Finally, there is the problem of changes in traditional practice coming by way of the revised practice or lack of practice on the part of the people. There seems no dobut that the pressures and the rewards of the American way of life have forced or induced great numbers of Jews to become less observant in their religious life. If this tendency continues by reason of increased secularism in American life or by reason of greater assimilation on the part of Jews in non-Jewish cultures, it is conceivable that Conservatism will shift further and further towards a nominal and non-denominational Judaism.

On the side of its contribution to American Jewry, however, it is claimed that Conservatism has performed a signal task in preventing the complete alienation and religious disorientation of large numbers of Jews having their background in East Europe. This function has now been completed with the end of large-scale Jewish immigrations. To what extent it will justify its existence in the future and what directions of ideology and practice Conservative Judaism will take, time alone will tell.

ROGER MATZERATH, S. A.

CARDINAL NEWMAN AND DEVOTION TO OUR LADY

The study of the Fathers by John Henry Newman, intensified throughout his Anglican years, imbued him with the faith they had concerning Mary, the New Eve. This study not only laid down a firm foundation for his own personal devotion to Our Lady, but was the means by which he was able to refute the arguments of his adversaries in his own Anglican and Roman Catholic days.

Newman believed that the dogma of the divine maternity is intimately bound up with the Incarnation, whence spring Mary's other special prerogatives. It was thus that he could speak of the unique virginity and the Immaculate Conception of Our Lady as being nothing extraordinary, when, as he said, we consider what is meant by the title, Mother of God. Such were the convictions he had as an Anglican ([1]).

Newman already believed in the Immaculate Conception prior to joining the Church of Rome and thus before it was defined a dogma. In the light of this, could his later views still have importance? Indeed, it may be said that they have a double importance. No one understood the psychology of the Anglican mind as well as Newman did; no one could, therefore, penetrate so deeply into its difficulties as his experience had, nor could anyone more than he offer those cogent solutions of which he was capable with his knowledge of both Anglican and Roman traditions. His *Letter to Pusey* is an explicit example of this; *Lectures on Certain Difficulties Felt by Anglicans Submitting to the Catholic Church* is another.

It is probable that the different tenets which Newman held on the corporal assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary as a Roman Catholic could have taken root in his Anglican days. His *Sermon Notes* (1849-78) show that he drew this mystery as an immediate inference from the Immaculate Conception, as the latter privilege was in the same way derived from the belief that Mary is the Second Eve. From a careful study of his writings, it is evident that many of Newman's doctrinal opinions regarding the Mother

---

([1]) Cf. J. H. Newman, *Parochial Sermons* (3rd ed. London: Rivington, Vol. II) pp. 131, 132.

of God remained substantially the same throughout his entire career. In his study of Newman's psychology of faith, Fr. S. J. Juergens affirms that the earlier and later views of Newman on the assent of faith show no considerable change (2). If Newman was able to produce the famous *Letter to Pusey* within a few weeks, it was because he had his doctrinal material ready for service for a long time. « In fact », writes Fr. F. J. Friedel, « this masterpiece of Marian literature is but the systematization, the crystalization of what Newman has taught and preached since the day he set himself to write the *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (3). Newman says of himself in the *Letter to Pusey* that he does not profess to be offering the latter any new matter on their controversy concerning Our Lady, nor any fact which he has not used himself on other occasions. His writings amply show this.

During the greater part of Newman's Anglican career in his position relative to the Blessed Virgin Mary there were two underlying currents in his thought which developed and flowed on in parallel streams, apparently incapable of uniting until the barriers of misunderstanding of the Roman doctrine concerning Our Lady were broken down.

> I thought, he wrote in his *Apologia,* the essence of her (the Roman Church's) offence to consist in the honour which she paid to the Saints and to Our Lady, and the more I grew in devotion to the Saints and Our Lady, the more impatient was I at Roman practices ... Such devotional manifestations in honour of Our Lady had been my great crux as regards Catholicism (4).

It is to be noted here that Newman speaks of growing in devotion to Mary. In another passage of his *Apologia* (which is the chief authority for his early thoughts) he further contrasts his reverence for the mother of the Saviour with the practices of the Church of Rome:

> In spite of my ingrained fears of Rome, and the decision of my reason and conscience against her usages ... I had a secret longing love of Rome, the mother of English Christianity and I had a true devotion to the Blessed Virgin, in whose College I lived, whose altar I served, and whose immaculate

---

(2) S. J. Jurgens, S. M. *Newman on the Psychology of Faith in the Individual* (New York: Macmillan, 1928), p. xi.

(3) F. J. Friedel, S. M. *Mariology of Cardinal Newman* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1928), p. 107.

(4) *Apologia pro vita sua* (London: Longmans Green and Co., 1865), p. 195.

Purity I had in one of my earliest printed sermons made much of (5).

From the recorded experiences of other converts to the Church of Rome, it is evident that many Anglicans are strongly attracted to the Blessed Virgin Mary, as Newman was; but though the latter felt this attraction, he would not allow himself to be swayed by sympathy rather than by reason. He had a long way to traverse before he could reconcile these two points of Roman theory and practice which to him seemed so decidedly at variance with one another. With practical doubts harassing his mind, to go to Rome would have been acting contrary to the dictates of his conscience. Only when his difficulties between the tenets of faith and devotional manifestations (religious honors as belonging to the objects of faith) should be solved, could he think of making the decisive step: this distinction for him vas vital.

Newman found his great difficulty not in speculative topics, nor in formal doctrines, but in the practical system of the Roman Church. Pusey, who also had this difficulty, remarked that the objection raised against Rome in the mind of the ordinary Englishman relates to the fact that the entire system which had developed around the fundamental doctrines concerning Our Lady seemed to make her functions co-extensive with those of Christ. She had become indispensable, as it were, in obtaining access to her divine Son and in the granting of graces to us.

Doctrinal Basis for Newman's Marian Devotion

The doctrinal basis for Newman's devotion to Mary is to be found in the Anglican formularies, in his own convictions on the Communion of Saints, his reasons for the silence of Scripture about Mary, and the traditional teaching of the Fathers.

Newman believed, in the first place, and attempted to point out that Roman doctrines had never been quite lost in the Church of England. And according to his theory, the doctrines concerning the Blessed Virgin were not condemned by the Anglican formularies, but only « current popular perversions of Roman doctrines as such ». Even with regard to the Homilies (6), which are recommended by the Articles, Newman affirmed that they contain no

---

(5) *Apologia*, op. cit. p. 165. The sermon to which reference is made here is that of March 25, 1832, entitled: « The Annunciation and the Reverence due to Mary ».

(6) The First Book of Homilies was published by order of King Henry VIII in 1547; of the twelve homilies it contained, five are attributed to Cranmer.

small portion of Roman theology. And if the Homilies did contain doctrinal views which could be called Roman, there seemed to him an extreme probability that the Convocation of 1571 received, or least did not reject, those doctrines. In some of the Homilies which have been incorporated into the Anglican system of thought, there is no clear discrimination between the Catholic and Protestant faith, no accurate recognition of formal Protestant principles and tenets, no precise definition of « Roman doctrine ». The XXXVth Article, in fact, states: « The second Book of Homilies doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the first Book of Homilies ». Hence, there occurred to Newman the great likelihood that the Articles were tolerant not only of what was called « Catholic teaching », but of much that was Roman. The doctrine of the Homilies is regarded as « godly and wholesome » by the Articles, and recognition of this is impressed on all subscribers to them.

The Homilies are regarded as worthy of reverence in as much as they elaborate some particular point of the Gospel teaching. With reference to the Saints and the greatest of them, Mary, Homily XX says that their souls are reigning in joy and in heaven with God. Since Mary, the Mother of the Saviour, is regarded as the highest of Saints in the Anglican Church, she is set forth in the Homilies as an excellent example of obedience, fervor, and zeal in divine worship. She is referred to as the « the Holy and Blessed Virgin Mary », and it is said that « in comparison with her we are base and vile ». The Homily on Repentance says that Our Lord « took our nature of the undefiled substance of the Blessed Virgin ».

That the *Book of Common Prayer* was Catholic in its origin Nevman tried to point out in Tract 90. He undoubtedly held the Creeds and doctrines which refer to the Mother of the Saviour and observed the official recognition the *Prayer Book* prescribed to honor her. And of the recitation of the Magnificat, which is to be found in the *Book of Common Prayer,* he has this to say to his parishioners:

> « ... we repeat her hymn day after day, yet consider for an instant in how different a mode *we* say it from that in which she at first uttered it. *We* even hurry it over, and do not think of the meaning of the words which came from the most highly favoured, awfully gifted of the children of men (7).

---

(7) J. H. Nehman, *Parochial Sermons* (3rd. ed. London; Rivington, 1940) Vol. II, pp. 131-32.

But while on the one hand, the Saints may be considered as models for imitation, on the other, there is no thought of invoking their assistance. Article XXII affirms that there is no authority for the invocation of Saints. The conclusion, therefore: devotion to the Saints — to the Queen of Saints, Mary, is not condemned; invocation, however, is ruled out.

Anyone with a proper understanding of the Incarnation must necessarily have some devotion to the Mother of God. Newman's religious sense drew him quite naturally to the Mother of the Redeemer. Yet, his reason and conscience formed by his education and loyal attachment to the Anglican Church forbade his giving adequate expression to his religious sentiments toward the Blessed Virgin Mary. Though he professed a true devotion to the Blessed Virgin and advanced in it, external manifestations of it proved to be a source of difficulty to him and stood in the way of giving his allegiance to the Church of Rome. It was only when he became more involved in the Oxford Movement and convinced that the Established Church was in schism that his categorical statements on usages discountenanced by his Church began to ring with a note of uncertainty.

The Communion of Saints and their office is a doctrine found in a number of Newman's Anglican sermons. According to his opinion, the Saints are the special glory of the Christian Church; they are one and all manifestations of one and the same unseen spiritual principle of power: living stones, member of the Body of Christ. The glorified Saviour after ascending into heaven becomes a principle of life, a secret origin of existence for all who believe through the grace of the Holy Ghost, for having joined to Himself the whole of humanity he also glorified it. Christ is the fruit-vine upon and out of which grow all Saints, though wild and barren by nature, that they may bring forth fruit unto God. In one of his early sermons, Newman calls them « ... the organs as if of one invisible governing Soul ... of one and the same directing mind of the Eternal Son of God ». He declares further that Sacred Scripture enlarges on the office of the Saints and proclaims that their work is to show the glory of God's kingdom, so that His glory and the power of His kingdom might be known to men.

In Newman's other sermons, as for example, « Communion with God » and « A Pattern for Christians », more of the rôle of the Saints and especially that of Mary is taught. All of us, Newman affirms, must rely on something, look up to and make ourselves one with something. While most men cast their lot with the visible world, the true Christian casts his with the Saints and Angels; they are our patterns, and this means that we are to copy

them. To be sure, there is but one God and one principal mediator, Jesus Christ. But as Newman says, it has pleased the Divine Wisdom to grant us protectors, intercessors, and models that are, or at least appear to be, very close to us. These are the Saints, the members of Christ's Mystical Body, who having reproduced in their own lives the divine perfections and virtues of Christ, are concerned in the welfare of their fellow-members, their brethren. Since their own sanctity depends upon their imitation of the Divine Exemplar, when we imitate them we do nothing else but imitate Jesus Christ Himself.

If this is why we honor the Saints and even the reason why we are called the « Holy People of God », Newman declares, how much more worthy of honor is Mary who gave to Our Lord his human body! Devotion to her remains distinct from that paid to God; it is offered to her as a human creature because of her perfections and of the high position in which God has placed her.

In his *Apologia* Newman describes Froude as having a very severe and high idea of the intrinsic excellence of virginity and considering the Blessed Virgin its great pattern. This same esteem was reflected by Newman himself, for at the age of fifteen he had the firm conviction that God called him to lead a single life. He too, like Froude, must have looked upon Mary as the great type of virginity, the *Virgo Virginum.*

These Anglican attitudes did not change when Newman became a Catholic; they became all the more convincing. There was the same harmonious consistency of the revealed system and the significance of the doctrine of the Communion of Saints, their place in the plan of God. The Virgin Mary was to be exalted for the sake of Jesus. Already as an Anglican Newman had said:

> She, as others, came into the world to do a work, she had a mission to fulfill, her grace and her glory are not for her sake but for her Maker's; and to her is committed the custody of the Incarnation; this is her appointed office ... (8).

The silence of Scripture with regard to Our Lady was a positive objection with which Newman in his Anglican days was confronted when preaching on the reverence due to Mary. It is true that little is said of her in the New Testament, but the silence is at most a comparative one. Newman adequately demonstrates the reasons for it as well as the fact that there is found « instruction in this silence » as there is in the mention of her. In his estimation there are two principal reasons why the Gospels do not tell us more about her.

---

(8) *Discourses to Mixed Congregations.* (London: Longmans Green and Co., 1849), cited by Mary Ryan, *Our Lady's Hours* (Cork, 1946) p. 185.

Scripture in the first place was written to give glory to Almighty God, not to exalt this or that Saint. It was written to show the course of God's great and marvelous providence; in its pages only Saints are heard of who were instruments of His purpose, as either introducing or preaching His Son. Why is it that we know more of St. Paul than of St. John who was Christ's favored Apostle? The reason is not far to seek. St. Paul was the more illustrious propagator and dispenser of His truth. For a somewhat similar reason, the Saviour hid from us the knowledge of His more sacred and familiar feelings towards His Mother. They were not to be exposed to the world as being unfit to know, and more especially there would be the danger that the honor given to Mary might eclipse the honor due to God.

What must have been the gifts of the Mother of God, Newman exclaims with awe — the favored one to whom He was bound by nature to revere, the one appointed to train and educate Him! Had the Blessed Virgin Mary been more fully disclosed to us, she would seemingly have been introduced for *her* sake, not for His. If her gifts had been clearly seen, honor would be hers, but at the same time the Giver would be less contemplated. Each Saint is seen working towards an end appointed to him by God. He is a favored servant but a mere instrument. And though we admire him, it is God whom we glorify in him. « But when anyone is introduced, full of gifts, yet without visible and immediate subserviency to Gods' designs, such a one seems to be revealed for his own sake » (9). We might be inclined to think more of the creature than the Creator, and this is a dangerous thing. It is too high a privilege for sinners like ourselves, Newman concludes, to know the best and innermost thoughts of the servants of God.

> The higher their gifts, the less fitted they are for being seen. Even St. John the Apostle was tempted to fall down in worship before an Angel who showed him the things to come. And, if he who had seen the Son of God was overcome by a creature, how is it possible we could bear to gaze upon a creature's holiness in its fullness, especially as we should be more able to enter into it, and estimate it, than to comprehend the infinite perfection of the Eternal Godhead? ... In particular, it is in mercy to us that so little is revealed about the Blessed Virgin, in mercy to our weakness, though of her there are 'many things to say' yet they are 'hard to be uttered, seeing we are dull of hearing' (Heb. 5: 11) (10).

---

(9) *Parochial Sermons,* Vol. II, p. 149.
(10) Ibid. p. 149.

In the second place, the more Saint Mary is considered in her person, says Newman, the more dangerous is such knowledge for us. While the Saints were influenced or inspired by Christ and made partakers of Him mystically, Our Lady had an especial unity with Christ. She is so close to God that we hardly seem to be able to put her in her proper position; and therefore the example of Scripture is the rule which the Church follows. The festivals which are set apart for her honor are foremost in honor of Our Lord, as the Purification which commemorates His Incarnation. We are never to separate her from Christ, but to think of her with and for her Son and to use her name as a memorial of His great condescension towards mankind. The Church acts thus, Newman remarks, and in this respect: the thought of her may be made most profitable to our faith; « for nothing is so calculated to impress on our minds that Christ is really partaker of our nature, and in all respects man, save sin only, as to associate Him with the thought of her, by whose ministration He became our brother » (11).

During the public ministry of Christ, Mary remained hidden, and she held a subordinate position in the Church after His Ascension. Similarly, though elevated above all creatures she did not ask Him to hold her up to the world's gaze but waited until her glory would be necessary for His. That the silence of the early Church about her person can be explained by the *disciplina arcani* is another argument used by Newman. The *disciplina arcani* was in force in the Chruch with regard to the Blessed Trinity and the Eucharist as well as in reference to Our Lady. As the Church was filled with such deep reverence for the doctrines which were held in reserve, she required special effort and an indication of Providence to come forward and speak about the Mother of God. Little is said of her up to the Council of Ephesus in 431. The time for her honors came when heretics said that God was not incarnate, when His name was dishonored. It was then that she did Him service, and when objections were raised against her, « she waived her claims and waited ».

The Testimony of the Fathers

The traditional teaching of the « Catholic Fathers » is sanctioned by the Anglican Church in the formularies. Newman was aware of this, and in his *Apologia* he points out that the Homilies reaffirm the authority of the Fathers of the Church.

---

(11) Ibid. p. 151.

With regard to their teaching concerning the Blessed Virgin Mary, Newman says that the Fathers are sufficient for him. In his *Letter to Pusey* in which he illustrates the traditional teaching of the Fathers concerning Our Lady, he affirms this: « I do not wish to say any more than they and will not say less. You, I know will profess the same and thus we can join issue on a clear and broad principle ... » And he reminds Pusey that what he will say about Our Lady will not cover any new matter but is the same material which he himself used during his days as an Anglican. On the basis of his own acknowledgement we can formulate his Anglican opinions concerning the traditional teaching of the Fathers regarding the Blessed Virgin.

Even before going over to Rome, Newman was aware that tradition must be taken into account when dealing with the prerogatives of Our Lady since some are only implied in Sacred Scripture; for the clear enunciation of others, tradition must be considered. The Bible, claimed Newman, tells us chiefly what to believe and intends to bind us in matters of faith. These essentials of faith, as the Incarnation, God revealed to us by inspiration because they are supernatural; nevertheless, we must depend upon tradition to illuminate and supplement Scripture.

By « tradition » Newman means dogmatic tradition, the teaching of doctrines (handed down through the centuries of the Church) not expressly formulated in the Bible and distinguished from purely human tradition — which is not guaranteed by divine authority nor by the Church.

It is impossible to separate dogma from life and Scripture from tradition. Christological dogma obliges us to recognize the divine maternity of the Virgin, but apart from Church tradition theology would find it difficult to discuss the astounding glorification of her office and dignity. To Newman's mind the Bible was never intended nor adapted to teach us our Creed. « The Bible », he declared, « may be said to give us the spirit of religion but the Church must provide the body in which the spirit is to be lodged » (12).

In his controversy with Pusey, Newman reminds him that he could not allow that the doctrines concerning the Mother of the Saviour had undergone a growth, although devotion to her has increased with the progress of centuries; doctrines relating to her have been in substance one and the same from the very beginning. The process of development in the Catholic Church as time goes on does not supersede the Fathers. It explains and completes them,

---

(12) *Arians of the Fourth Century* (London: Longmans Green and Co. 1833) p. 50, cited by W. Walsh in his *Secret History of the Oxford Movement* (London, 1897) p. 3.

particularly so with reference to their teachings on the *Theotokos*. Newman was aware that Pusey even though an Anglican would not deny that the whole doctrine was to be found in Scripture. Nor did he believe Pusey would profess to dispense with Tradition but would admit the appeal to antiquity and the force of the traditional teaching of the Fathers concerning Our Lady. On the basis of this principle, Newman goes on to ask: « What is the great rudimental teaching of antiquity concerning her? »

The Fathers, first of all, say that Mary is the Second Eve. What does this imply? Adam had named Eve the « mother of the living » not only in fact but in dignity. As she had her own general relation to the human race, so she also had her own special role to play in its trial and its fall in Adam. The Bible tells us that Eve had an integral share in it; she was a responsible instrument, a *sine qua non*, a positive active cause of it. And since she was recognized as a real agent in the temptation and its issue, she had her share in its punishment as well — and she suffered accordingly.

There were three parties involved: the serpent, the woman, and the man. When God pronounced their sentence these three were to meet again, but this time the *woman* was to be the mother of the new Adam: « I will put enmity between thee and the woman and between thy seed and her seed » (Gen. 3: 15). The Seed of the woman is the Word Incarnate, and the Woman, whose seed or Son he is, is the Virgin Mary.

> This interpretation and the parallelism it involves seems to be undeniable; but at all events (and this is my point) the parallelism is the doctrine of the Fathers from the earliest time; and this being established, by the position and office of Eve in our Fall, we are able to determine the position and office of Mary in our restoration ([13]).

Newman emphasizes that many Fathers have drawn a parallel between the First and Second Eve. Justin, Tertullian, and St. Irenaeus are his important examples. The comparison between Eve and Mary, between the fruit that brought death and the fruit that was filled with blessing was outlined by Justin already about the year 155. This parallel cannot but help to impress a certain significance on the mind, Newman affirms. Tertullian in turn describes the office of the Blessed Virgin thus: Mary blotted out Eve's fault and brought back to salvation what would have gone into perdition. And St. Irenaeus adds to this testimony by saying that « Mary became both to herself and to the whole human race

---

([13]) J. H. Newman, *The New Eve*, compled by Patrick Radcliffe (Oxford: Newman Book shop, 1952) p. 14.

the cause of salvation ». Newman cites him in another place as saying further: « And, as by a virgin the human race had been bound by death, by a virgin it is saved, the balance being preserved, a virgin's disobedience by a virgin's obedience ».

To Newman's mind the comparison of Mary with Eve by the Fathers and the conclusions they drew were eminently satisfactory. Following this same pattern of thought in one of his early sermons, he wrote:

> In her was now to be fulfilled the promise which the world had been looking out for during thousands of years. The Seed of the woman, announced to guilty Eve, after long delay, was at length appearing on earth, and was to be born of her. In her the destinies of the world were to be reversed, and the serpent's head bruised. On her was bestowed the greatest honour ever put upon any individual of our fallen race ([14]).

There are many other Fathers besides Justin, Tertullian, and St. Irenaeus who believe and testify that the proposition « Mary is the new Eve » is traditional teaching. But the three Newman makes particular mention of were chosen principally for two reasons: first, Justin, Tertullian, and Irenaeus are second century witnesses of the traditional doctrines of the Primitive Church, and no one who acknowledges the force of early testimony can reasonably object to the high doctrine concerning the Woman chosen by God as the New Eve. And secondly, these writers are independent witnesses. There are two ways of determining Apostolic tradition, Newman explains — when independent witnesses enunciate one and the same doctrine though they are in different places, and when credible witnesses attest that their doctrine is indeed apostolical. These norms are singularly adaptable to Justin, Tertullian, and St. Irenaeus whose testimony is of a highly trustworthy character; and they proclaim one and the same doctrine concerning Mary's office as the New Eve although finding themselves in three different parts of the world. Pusey can hardly deny the force of Newman's argument inasmuch as he says the Anglican Church appeals not to the Fathers individually but « as witnesses of the Universal Church ». Theirs is an explicit tradition, and by force of it there follow truths which are implicit: considering for example, Eve's condition in the Garden of Eden in relation to Mary, we say that Mary had no part in sin, and a large measure

---

([14]) *Parochial Sermons*, vol. II, p. 143.

of grace. The implicit tradition of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption is to be found in the Eve-Mary doctrine of the Fathers.

Conclusion

Early in his career, Newman hesitated to call Mary the Mother of God, but his doubts ceased soon after as his writings clearly show. In these same writings unmistakable beliefs are found in a number of the Blessed Virgin's privileges which Newman believed derived from her greatest dignity — that of her Divine Maternity. The *Notes on Athanasius* which complete the Anglican sources for his Marian doctrine and devotion are an example of this. They were published before his conversion to Rome in connection with the Library of the Fathers, and in this work (the *Notes*) he gives a concise history of the title « Theotokos » and the teaching of the Fathers concerning the Divine Maternity as well as the perpetual virginity of Christ's Mother. In several of his *Parochial Sermons* Newman affirms belief in the Immaculate Conception and in the office of the New Eve in cooperating in the work of man's redemption. As a Catholic, Newman used St. John's reference to the « Woman clothed with the sun » (Apoc., 12, 1 ff.) to explain the corporal Assumption of Mary. As an Anglican he had used the same passage in the *Development of Christian Doctrine* to explain Mary's exaltation in Sacred Scripture.

Newman's theories in defense of the silence of Scripture about Our Lady are unique as they are surprising. They are the independent conclusions of his personal study and reverence for the Mother of the Redeemer and were held even before the Oxford Movement was under way.

The only doctrine that underwent modification in Newman's Catholic days was the cultus to the Saints, which was his special crux, as he says, regarding Roman practices. In his later revision of the *Notes on Athanasius* he exposed it as a necessary deduction from the Divine Indwelling in the soul of the Christian who has already merited his eternal reward.

Cardinal Newman while still a member of the Anglican Church may have been a Protestant in fact regarding the question of invocations to Our Lady, but with regard to all other doctrines concerning her he was a Catholic in theory, practice, and spirit.

Sister Mary Regina Jazwinska
of the Sisters of the Holy Family of Nazareth

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

The death of Pope Pius XII was accorded an unprecedented amount of space in the press throughout the world, both in non-Catholic as well as in Catholic newspapers and periodicals. His pontificate is considered as having been remarkably singular for its many achievements and for the great influence for good that it brought to bear on the civilized world of today.

Among the tributes of the Catholic press to Pope Pius was the October 11th issue of the London Tablet *which was specially dedicated to his memory. In a well-written account of the career of the late Pope, it brings into relief the many high lights that marked his long and fruitful life. A section of this report which we feel will be of particular interest to the readers of* Unitas *is that which deals with his policy towards non-Catholics. The text of this section follows*:

Pius XII and non-Catholics

The Marian Year was also the ninth centenary year of the great schism which severed so much of the Christian East from the Roman obedience, and prayer for the healing of schism and division and for a return to Christian unity was asked by the Pope as one of the great intentions of the Marian Year. It was, indeed, a central purpose of prayer during the Holy Year of 1950, which was to be the year of the « great return » to Christian unity.

Pius XII broke with precedent in inviting the Patriarch of Constantinople to be present at his coronation in 1939; the Patriarch did not come in person, but he sent a representative, and the Pope in turn was represented at the coronation of the new Oecumenical Patriarch, Athenagoras, in 1948. The increasing pretensions of the restored Patriarchate of Moscow, and the consequently difficult relations between Moscow and the Phanar, brought a new sense of mutual interest to the view of the Holy See taken by the Patriarch of Constantinople. The espousal of Communist propaganda by so many leaders of the Orthodox Church in the Slavonic countries likewise brought a fresh cordiality to

the attitude of the Greeks towards the Holy See during and after the civil war in Greece.

The first Encyclical of Pius XII, *Summi Pontificatus,* renewed the perennial appeal of the Holy See for a return to Christian unity; and it was expressed again in subsequent Encyclicals written for particular anniversaries, especially *Orientalis Ecclesiae,* which marked the fifteenth centenary of the death of St. Cyril of Alexandria, in 1944, and *Orientales Omnes,* at the end of 1945, which marked the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the reconciliation of that Ruthenian Church which, when the Pope wrote, was enduring so savage a persecution at the hands of the Soviet Communists in the Western Ukraine. The Pope spoke again of this persecution in December, 1952, in *Orientales Ecclesias;* he also referred then to the position in Bulgaria, where a Catholic Bishop had lately been sentenced to death, and to the persecution in Rumania which had been the subject of a separate Apostolic Letter in the previous March. But *Orientales Ecclesias* was mainly concerned with the Ukraine, and there were some who thought that it had been written partly in order to offset the impression given to some among the Ukrainians by the Apostolic Letter *Ad Universos Russiae Populos* of the previous July: this, said some of the Ukrainians, thought too much in « Greater Russian » terms, in its survey of the history of Christianity in Russia. It was written to consecrate all the peoples of Russia to the Immaculate Heart of Mary, in accordance, as many assumed, with the request by Our Lady at Fatima in 1918.

To find a precedent for a letter such as this, addressed to a nation at large, and to a nation not in communion with the Holy See, one had to go back to the letter *Ad Anglos* of Leo XIII in 1895, which appealed to the English to return to the unity of the Church. All the Encyclical Letters concerned with the Eastern Church are, of course, addressed to Eastern Christians in communion with Rome. Pius XII honoured all these communities when, at his first Consistory, in 1946, he made the Patriarch of the Armenians of Cilicia a Cardinal; and Cardinal Tisserant, as Secretary throughout the Pontificate of the Sacred Congregation for the Affairs of the Eastern Church, travelled widely in the East.

Throughout the war, and, indeed, in the years since the war, it was noticeable that Pius XII addressed himself frequently in his broadcast allocutions not only to Catholics, but to all Christians of good will. Indeed, the Encyclical *Fulgens Corona,* which announced the Marian Year of 1954, called upon those « who are separated from us by a long-standing schism, but whom nevertheless we love with the heart of a father », to join in the prayers

to Our Lady; « May the Blessed Virgin », the Pope went on, « see the hearts of all who are proud to be Christians raised to her in the union of charity at least ». Twice during the post-war years, through the Holy Office, Pius XII published rulings about the extent to which Catholics may associate themselves in common activities with other Christians. The first was a brief *Monitum*, published in June, 1948, drawing attention to certain contraventions of Canon Law which had taken place in this connection in various countries. The second was the « Instruction to Local Ordinaries about the Oecumenical Movement », dated December 20th, 1949, and published at the end of the following February. This empowered local Ordinaries, during an experimental period of three years, to permit priests, and at times laymen, without reference to the Holy See, to participate under defined conditions in mixed meetings for the public discussion of religious questions.

When the second world war had ended, on several occasions during 1945 and 1946 Pius XII spoke in Hebrew to Jewish leaders who came to thank him personally for all that he and the Church had done for the Jewish people during the war years. In April, 1945, the Congress of Jewish Communities in Italy addressed a special message of thanks to him, and on November 29th of the same year a group of seventy representatives of the Jewish people who had just been liberated from German concentration camps requested, as they put it, « the great honour to thank His Holiness personally for the extraordinary generosity which he had shown them when they were persecuted, during the frightful period of Nazi-Fascism ». The Pope in addressing them spoke of « the abyss of dissension, hatred, and mania for persecution » of which they had become the victims, declaring that the Holy See « has never agreed, not even in the most hazardous moments, with concepts which the history of civilisation will range among the most deplorable and ignominious aberrations of human thinking and feeling »; and this his visitors knew.

The Vatican's relations with the Zionists, however, became difficult when the State of Israel was established, when the Encyclical *Redemptoris Nostris* called for an international regime for Jerusalem and its environs and for a special international agreement for the protection of the Holy Places. Both the majority and the minority reports of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine, which had visited the Holy Land in 1947, agreed that there should be an international regime for Palestine. The vote in favor of the partition of the Holy Land which the General Assembly of the United Nations gave on November 29th, 1947, was supported by many Christian nations only in the confident be-

lief that these plans for an international status for Jerusalem were an integral part of the settlement by which the Jews were prepared to abide. The increasing violence in the Holy Land between that time and the establishment of the State of Israel, which alone prevented the international status from being established in the summer of 1948, was a source of great distress to the Pope, who never ceased thereafter to call for an international regime for Jerusalem. But this painful subject never obscured in the minds of the Jewish people the gratitude which they felt for the protection extended to their race during the war by Bishops in German-occupied territory and for the constant attitude of the Pope himself towards the abominable anti-semitism of the Nazis.

The pontificate has also seen a notable development in the relations between the Catholic Church and the Moslem world. The proclamation of the Independence of the Syrian and Lebanese Republics, free of the French mandatory power, at the beginning of 1944, was followed in each case by the establishment of diplomatic relations with the Holy See. In October, 1947, the first Moslem envoy to be accredited to the Holy See since the fifteenth century arrived in Rome, the envoy of Egypt, where diplomatic relations had also been established. It was a year later that the Shah of Iran called at the Vatican and was received by the Pope; he was to have been received again this month, on October 13th.

These relations with the Moslem world, of the Cross with the Crescent, are, of course, of a different order to the relations of the Catholic Church with the Christian bodies not in communion with the Holy See which we have been discussing above, or to the relations between the Church and the Jews, between the Holy See and the State of Israel. But all should be seen in the large setting of a world more and more divided between those who hold religious values and those who reject them: between those who believe in God and the militant atheism of international Communism.

* * *

The Lambeth Conference 1958

On 3 July 1958 began the ninth Lambeth Conference. Three hundred and ten bishops of the Anglican Communion had come from all quarters of the globe at the invitation of the Archbishop of Canterbury to discuss matters of common interest to their Church. The first of these conferences met in 1867 and settled the question of authority. A Lambeth Conference has no authority

to impose any decision, whether doctrinal or disciplinary, on any of the Provinces of the Anglican Communion. The voice of its bishops speaking in unison will, doubtless, have great weight, but each Province remains free to implement or not resolutions of the Conference.

The published account, *The Lambeth Conference 1958,* opens with the list of the bishops attending. The Provinces of Canterbury and York (England), of Wales, Ireland and Scotland were obviously fully represented (74 bishops). The United States sent 99 bishops, the largest contingent of all. Canada, the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, the West Indies, Japan, West Africa and Central Africa between them accounted for 116 bishops. There were, also, 31 bishops, not members of any overseas province, but dependent on the jurisdiction of Canterbury; their dioceses, many of them wide tracts of territory or distant islands, are scattered over the surface of the globe. There was one Chinese Bishop — of Hong Kong. The other Chinese bishops had excused themselves as being too occupied, Leading members of some other Churches had been invited to attend the Conference as delegates, not to take part in the discussions of the Anglican bishops, but to do honour to the occasion and to meet, at least in informal conversation, groups of Anglicans. The Scandinavian Churches, the German Evangelical Church, the Church of Scotland (Presbyterian), the Free Church Federal Council of England (i. e. of Nonconformist denominations) sent delegates who were received in full session on 4 July. On the next day there were received the delegates of the Old Catholics, of the Oriental Churches of Constantinople, Russia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and the Russians of London, and of the Armenian Church.

The Conference lasted for a little over five weeks; its discussions for four weeks. Of these the first and the last were devoted to full sessions; the intervening fortnight was occupied by meetings of the sectional committees, among which the whole gathering of bishops had been so divided as to make the representation as general as possible. Each of these committees had a large subject to discuss and to report on to the plenary Conference. These reports, however, were not the last word of the Conference. That was the Encyclical Letter and the Resolutions that, founded on the reports of the committees, were agreed to after discussion in plenary session. The subjects submitted for examination to the five sectional committees were: The Holy Bible, its Authority and Message; Church Unity and the Church Universal; Progress in the Anglican Communion; The Reconciling of Conflicts between and within Nations; The Family in Contemporary Society.

The following pages are devoted to an account of the reports of the committees, rather than to relating the admittedly more authoritative, but also more schematic, Resolutions, because the reports give a broader view of Anglican thought and tendencies. The space allotted to the several treatments is unequal because the reports themselves are of different lengths and also because they offer more or less of new or debatable matter.

The report on the Bible, breathing customary Anglican reverence for the sacred Books, breaks no new ground. Stress is laid on the necessity of combining respect for biblical authority with scholarly criticism. The radical, evolutionary criticism of a bygone age is dismissed without regret, but no welcome is given to the new Fundamentalism. The true authority of the Scriptures is « because of their connection with Jesus Christ ». « In the light of the relation of the Bible to Jesus Christ we can affirm that the Bible possesses the authority of God's truth and is the work of God's inspiration, without ascribing inerrancy to every statement which the Bible contains » (p. 2. 8). The Bible is the basis of the faith. The Church must live by and 'under' the Bible, purveying its lessons by reading, preaching, the Liturgy, and study of all kinds.

The committee that dealt with *Church Unity and the Church Universal* split into subcommittees for the examination of specific proposals. The whole committee, however, discussed the general question and combined in recommending to the plenary Conference a 'Statement on Christian Unity' which, written in the ecumenical spirit of the 'Appeal to All Christian Peoples' of the 1920 Conference, also repeats some of its text. The general tenor of the Statement, as well as many of its individual declarations, will certainly be endorsed by all thoughtful Christians. E. g.: « We believe that the mission of the Church is nothing less than the remaking and gathering together of the whole human race by incorporation into Christ. In obedience to this mission we must continually pray and work for the visible unity of all Christian believers of all races and nations in a living Christian fellowship of faith and sacrament, of love and prayer, witness and service » (p. 2, 21). Its closing paragraph, too, could well be applied also outside the Anglican Communion: « Finally we appeal to all our people to show a spirit of charity in their dealings with other Christians wherever they may be, to respect other Christian Churches, to refrain from harsh or unkind words about them, whether in speech or in writing, and to seek to understand both their life and their doctrine by common study and by personal contacts. Above all, we appeal to them to pray for Christian

Unity, privately, corporately, and together with members of other Christian communions, that all believers may be united ' in the way Christ wills and by the means He chooses ', and to remember always that the nearer we draw to Christ, the nearer we draw to one another » (p. 2, 23).

The committee recommended, (and a Resolution approved), a change in terminology, namely that for unrestricted *communicatio in sacris* (like what the Church of England enjoys with the Old Catholics) the term ' full communion ' should in future be employed since that is what it really is. The term ' intercommunion ' then, would be used for the various degrees of relations other than full communion. Churches, however, in full communion with Anglican Provinces are not necessarily members of the Anglican Communion. The danger is foreseen that large groups of Anglicans that join with other bodies to form new Churches may lose touch with their Mother Church, and that such new Churches may be too isolated. The committee, therefore, recommended, and a Resolution approved, that within five years the Archbishop of Canterbury should invite representatives of all episcopal Churches with which some Anglican Church is in communion to meet representatives of all the Anglican Provinces in conference for mutual advice and help.

The rest of the report is mostly taken up with reviewing schemes for reunion in which Anglican Churches are involved. The Church of England, which led the way, and five other Anglican Churches have recognized the episcopal Orders of the Church of South India, and the Protestant Episcopal Church of America seems likely to do so in the near future. In India, Pakistan and in Ceylon schemes of reunion have been prepared which the Conference has not only blessed but has even held up as models to other groups seeking union. One element of the schemes, however, has caused the committee some slight misgiving. In both schemes the ministry will be ' unified ' with the three grades of bishops, presbyters, and deacons at the time of inaugeration, an arrangement which the Anglicans find very satisfactory. Relations of full communion, however, are to be retained betwen the constituent bodies of the prospective new Churches and their parent Churches, even though most of these are non-episcopal. The committe, though unhappy about this, still did not think it an insuperable obstacle to recognising ' the ministry of the resulting Churches as fully accredited and in historic continuity with that of the undivided Church ' (p. 2 35). Many pages of the report are devoted to suggestions about the formulae to be used for the unification of the ministry. The Conference approves of those contained in these schemes, but would like one or

two modifications, e.g., that in the prayers the 'Church of God' should be put first and then the title of the local Church.

The outsider cannot help but feel unhappy when he reads these compromises on the ministry, for there seems to him to be an element of make-believe about them. All these schemes of reunion — South India, Ceylon, conversations with Scottish Presbyterians and English Methodists — contain some phrase insisting that 'no particular interpretation of episcopacy shall be demanded from any minister' (even if that minister is a newly-consecrated bishop) 'or member of the United Church'. In the Ceylon scheme Anglicans, Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists are involved: in that of India-Pakistan, Baptists, the Church of the Brethren, The Disciples of Christ, Anglicans, Methodists(episcopal and non-episcopal) and a combination of Presbyterians and Congregationalists. One feels that what is being done is for pure convenience. The Anglicans insist on episcopacy; the others to please them say equivalently: 'We don't really believe in your episcopacy, but if you're set on it, we'll have it: it's probably as good as most other ways of organizing the Church, provided it is kept well down by being associated in its function with the presbyterate and the laity'. So formulae of 'unification' are devised whereby the Anglican is satisfied that he has ordained his new associates with episcopal Orders, and they, having all the time made it quite clear that any form of re-ordination is the one thing they will not stand for, since their Orders in their eyes are as valid as any one elses', are equally satisfied that they have received nothing essential that they did not possess before.

The conversations of Anglicans with the Presbyterians of Scotland and with the Methodists of England are next considered in the report. Both of these projects are still in the early stages of discussion. The committee, therefore, could do little more than record events up to date and wish for a happy issue. The papal Instruction *On the Ecumenical Movement* is hailed as a sign of 'an increasing recognition by the Roman authorities of the importance of the Ecumenical Movement'. Octaves of unity which both Churches observe, discussion between properly equipped representatives, cooperation in conference to promote scholarly research, are all to be encouraged as leading to better relations. The Orthodox conference in Moscow of 1948 could not accept Anglican Orders. Since then, Russians have visited England, and an English delegation has had theological meetings with Russians in Moscow, all of a very friendly nature. The Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon (Anglican) has been engaged in conversations with both the Syrian Orthodox (Malankara

Jacobite) Church and the Mar Thoma Church of Malabar, and hopes for yet more intimate ties with them.

Relations with other bodies are rapidly reviewed in the report — with the Scandinavian Churches, the Netherland Reformed Church (a new contact, at the request of the Dutch), the Spanish Reformed Episcopal Church, the Lusitanian Church(of Portugal) and the Philippine Independent Church whose ministry stems from bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America.

All these endeavours to promote unity are set in the wider framework of the World Council of Churches, reference to which closes the report.

The report on *Progress in the Anglican Communion* is very long and is divided into three sections, being the reports of the three sub-committees. *Missionary Appeal and Strategy* is the title of the first section. The Church, of its nature, is missionary, but it is faced now by five major difficulties — nationalism, distrust, industrialism, the resurgence of some non-Christian religions, and ' Christian Deviations '. The Anglican Communion has sponsored much missionary endeavour and in all parts of the world. To utilize its missionary energy to the full there is need of more co-ordination, co-operation, consolidation, and cohesion. For that, it is recommended that the Advisory Council on Missionary Strategy should be revitalized by the appointment of a full-time secretary, who would be a center or information and contact for the various Anglican Churches and Provinces. Today special opportunities and needs are arising in African townships where large numbers of Africans, away from the constraints of tribal custom, present a particular problem; in South America where ' vast masses owe no allegiance to the Roman Catholic Church and are a prey to materialism or to distorted forms of the Christian faith '; in the Chinese dispersion, particularly in Hong Kong, Malaya, Singapore and Taiwan; in New Guinea where ' thousands of primitive people hitherto untouched by the Gospel ' have lately been discovered.

The evangelism of such as these, and indeed of the masses of people living in professedly Christian countries who rarely enter a church, is a challenge that brooks no refusal and no delay. But it must be full. ' It is an *encounter*: it is *confronting* a person with the Person of Jesus Christ', and it should aim at the conversion of the whole man — mind, emotions, and will. That is a task, not only of the ordained ministry, but also of the laity, ' ordained ' for that by Baptism and Confirmation.

A second sub-committee concentrated on *The Book of Common Prayer*. The Book of 1662 is the basic pattern of worship, but it is

not immutable, for in many Provinces changes have over the centuries been made and today's liturgical awareness presages others.

The Book however, is *a* bond of union, even if not *the* bond, within the Anglican Communion, and should not be lightly changed to the bewilderment of the laity. Certain features in the Books of Common Prayer can be regarded as essential to the safeguarding of the unity of the Anglican Communion, others as most characteristic, while modifications could well be considered in certain respects (details on pp. 2. 80, 81 of the report). The report proceeds to make some specific suggestions to guide amendments of the Holy Communion service and then has a section entitled *The Eucharistic Sacrifice,* from which the following quotations are taken.

'It is commonly acknowledged that what Christ accomplished on the Cross can properly be described as a sacrifice.'

'This sacrifice is an act of willing obedience.'

'This sacrifice is once and for all, but though it cannot be repeated, it is not merely a past fact; it is not only an event in history, but the revelation of eternal truth... The fact revealed in time past has to be continually translated into the present by the operation of the Spirit.'

Christ died for us on the Cross: He is now in us. 'And in virtue of this union, we are now identified with him both in his death and passion, and in his resurrection, life and glory.

'In our baptism we were united with him by the likeness of his death (Rom. 6. 5) and in the Eucharist we abide in him as we eat his Body and drink his Blood (John 6. 56). So we come to the Father in and through Jesus our great High Priest. We have nothing to offer that we have not first received, but we offer our praise and thanksgiving for Christ's sacrifice for us and so present it again, and ourselves in him, before the Father. We are partakers of the sacrifice of Christ (1 Cor. 10. 16), and this is shown forth by our sacrifice of praise to God continually through Christ (Heb. 13. 15), and by our life of service and suffering for his sake in the world (Phil. 3. 9, 10). We ourselves, incorporate in the mystical body of Christ, are the sacrifice we offer. Christ with us offers us in himself to God.' (pp. 2. 83, 84)

This exposition of doctrine by the committe is very subjective. It is 'we', not Christ, who do all the offering. 'We offer our praise ...' 'we are the sacrifice we offer.' It is true that it is said: 'Christ with us offers us in himself to God', but that is put on a par with offering of 'our life of service and suffering for his sake in the world', which of its nature is not specifically connected with the Eucharist. In the next paragraph, a quotation from A. G. Hebert, cited with approval by the committee, there comes the phrase:

'The true celebrant is Christ the High Priest', but as the sentence develops He is allotted no function of sacrifice within the eucharistic context — all the offering is the people's, united, admittedly, with Him in the Mystical Body. The general tradition of the Church, both in East and West, demands more than that. Christ truly is the chief High Priest, and as such, in His capacity of Head of the Church (and so acting for and with us), is the chief offerer of the Sacrifice.

Various other parts of the Prayer Book are reviewed also. An outline of essentials for the baptismal service is suggested. The ordinal is commented on and the Anglican insistence on episcopacy advocated by connecting the 'orders of ministers in Christ's Church, bishops, priests and deacons' with *episcopé*, i. e. 'Christ's own oversight and direction of his members, as Head of the Body', which is an essential of the Church. Besides other points, *Prayers for the Departed* are discussed. It is recognized that human nature wants them, but the committee hesitates to suggest any theology that would justify them for Anglicans. There is a similar indecision over *The Commemoration of Saints and Heroes in the Anglican Communion,* a subject that has been studied by a special commission since the previous Lambeth Conference. What requirements should be demanded? How can it be proved if the minimum requirements have been met? Who has the competence to judge? Difficult questions and fraught with danger of abuse, if there is no *safe* authority to decide.

The third topic, the concern of the third sub-committee, was *Ministries and Manpower.* The burden of the report is 'the harvest is great and the labourers few'. So there is discussion of how to attract and best train suitable candidates for the ministry and to what degree non-ordained helpers can be employed. Hong Kong and the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon allow the use of 'auxiliary priests', i. e. ordained men who do not give up their normal secular businesses. The laity also has its function, and the clergy should remind them of it and urge them to prepare for it. 'The first step needs to be the recovery of the Christian home. To all those who receive the Church's blessing in marriage there comes a challenge to create a home in which family prayer is given its rightful place, where family worship engenders a spiritual cohesion, where children are brought by the example and teaching of their parents to know the truth as it is in Jesus, and where a Christian discipline springing from love supplies the family with its true freedom. But it is possible to go further and try to see such homes as centers of evangelisation and fellowship for every street or for every village'. (P. 2, 113). *O si sic omnes!*

The fourth committee studied *The Reconciling of Conflicts between and within Nations.* The report analyzes the causes of conflict and asserts that the Christian solution is fundamentally the 'preaching of Christ crucified in his ministry of reconciliation' which is to be performed in practice on the level of the individual. No single answer could be found to the moral question raised by the atom bomb, but assuredly everyone must do all he can to have its production controlled. The report surveys, too, specific instances of conflicts within nations — the colour-bar of the U.S.A., the Israeli-Arab problem etc., and speaks at length on the need of integrating the African into full participation in public life and opportunities.

The last report in *The Lambeth Conference 1958* is entitled *The Family in Contemporary Society,* and it is this report that has been most talked about; for in it the use of artificial contraceptives is declared not only legitimate, but in certain circumstances desirable. The relative resolution reads: 'The Conference believes that the responsibility for deciding upon the number and frequency of children has been laid by God upon the consciences of parents everywhere: that this planning, in such ways as are mutually acceptable to husband and wife in Christian conscience, is a right and important factor in Christian family life and should be the result of positive choice before God. Such responsible parenthood, built on obedience to all the duties of marriage, requires a wise stewardship of the resources and abilities of the family as well as a thoughtful consideration of the varying population needs and problems of society and the claims of future generations'. (P. 1. 57)

As a correspondent to the *Church Times* (5 September) points out, the Lambeth Conferences have 'progressed' in their teaching on this subject. For Lambeth 1908, 'deliberate tampering with nascent life [by which it meant 'artificial means of restriction of the family.'] is repugnant to Christian morality'. Lambeth 1930 hedged: 'The primary purpose for which marriage exists is the procreation of children ... Nevertheless ... the Conference agrees that other methods [i. e. besides complete abstinence] may be used, provided that this is done in the light of the same Christian principles'. The Lambeth Conference of 1958 saw three ends of marriage, 'the procreation of children, the fulfillment and completion of husband and wife in each other, and the establishment of a stable environment' for the resultant family. Of these Christ has spoken only about the second, affirming its life-long character. The three ends are not subordinate one to another, but complementary. Procreation, therefore, is not *the* primary purpose, but *a* primary purpose, and the third end may be, in part at least,

frustrated if the first end is always insisted on. Certain ways of 'planning' the family are ruled out of court by the report without further ado, though the committee clearly could not decide on the morality of sterilization, whether practised by individuals or promoted on a large scale by governments, to limit families. It was, however, agreed that the population problem in certain countries has made 'family planning an urgent necessity', i. e. in the committee's view, a legitimate solution of the economic difficulty.

The population problem, probably, weighed heavily on the committee-members' minds when they studied this ethical question — that and the fact that nowadays most people do, in fact, practise birth control. Lambeth 1908 was less under fire; its solution was more judicial. The chief ends of marriage are two (Lambeth's third end — the stable environment for the family — is rather a corollary or consequence of the first end) — procreation and the mutual completion and help of the spouses, but these are inseparable in fact, so that naturally the one cannot and should not be pursued to the utter exclusion of the other. The act of marriage of its nature attains both ends, and the one, the possibility of procreation of children, is the nobler because it is not limited to the purposes of only the two participants, but lifts them to the higher level of the race. Indeed, it conditions the second end, for it renders it creative, it tends to perpetuate their mutual love in the fruit of love and to integrate what could be mere mutual satisfaction of two individuals into God's cosmic plan. For the gift and the power of propagating the species that man and woman have is an ability to cooperate with God in the production of new life. It is not theirs alone: they hold it in their keeping for the benefit of the human family. To interfere, then, so as to frustrate the larger purpose and to attain only the purpose of the individual is, as Lambeth 1908 rightly said, 'repugnant to Christian morality'.

There is one other point of ethical practice approved by the committee, that runs counter to Catholic teaching. 'In the strongest terms, Christians reject the practise of induced abortion, or infanticide, which involves the killing of a life already conceived (as well as a violation of the personality of the mother), save at the dictate of strict and undeniable medical necessity' (p. 2. 148). This is the question that was debated at length in England, also in the newspapers, a few years ago, apropos of a papal utterance. It is a matter of regret that the committee could not see the obvious principle involved, that evil may never be done that good, however great, may result. Medical action, whose primary effect is infanticide is surely like killing the little Princes

in the Tower: the elimination of a threat from innocents by murder. Therefore no medical necessity, however strict and undeniable, can justify it.

Strange though it may sound after what has been said above, most of this report on the Family is excellent and could be read with profit by all Christians. Stress is laid on the need of Christian love as the bond of the family, which should have stability and afford the children the opportunity of sound development in Christian practice and human responsibility. Divorce, therefore, is wrong: it is forbidden by Christ. Many of the dangers to marriage can be prevented by wise instruction before and contact after. Cultural pressures and other factors that undermine stability should be reduced to the minimum by all those concerned, — industry, government, Churches. Nations that have should help the nations that, with rapidly increasing populations, have not enough resources of food: and the Churches should urge on the authorities this obligation of charity.

'At the heart of the Christian gospel is that thought of reconciliation which has been the keynote of our Conferences' (The Encyclical Letter, p. 1. 18). May the fruit of the Conference also be reconciliation.

JOSEPH GILL, S. J.

* * *

A PRESBYTERIAN VIEW OF LATIN AMERICA

In *the Ecumenical Review*, January, 1958, the Rev. Benjamin Moraes, a Presbyterian, wrote on « The tremendous Importance of Ecumenism in Latin America » (pp. 182-86). Professor Moraes is Pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Copacabana and Professor of Criminal Law in the University of Rio de Janeiro. He lists four main religious influences:

1. the Roman Catholic Church;
2. 'Independent groups or sects', on the fringe of Protestantism.
3. Communism.
4. 'The traditional churches'.

1. The following are indications of his view of the Roman Catholic Church:

« Roman Catholic influence in South America is rather a matter of outward forms; but the Protestant Churches and groups are trying to improve moral conditions in these areas (the State of Goiaz, the South of Mato Grosso and the North of Paranà,

Brazil) by conducting intense and persistent campaigns of evangelism ». (p. 183).

« In Latin America the Roman Catholic Church shows a very different face from that which is known in France, Belgium and other countries. In Latin America it is intolerant, exclusivist, unilateral. Everybody knows what happened in the former liberal Colombia, after nine years of Roman Catholic political dominion in that noble country ».

« If in the near future Latin America spreads its political influence across the world, will it be an influence of intolerance and desrespect for human rights? » (p. 184).

« If Latin America is to play an important role in the world in the near future, what kind of influence will it have? If it is Roman Catholic, will it be the most intolerant religious programme that exists among the different nations of the earth? (p. 185).

2. The ' independent sects ', such as ' Mormons, Jehovah's Witnesses, Four-Square Gospel, Tents of Divine Cure, Soul Clinic International and about a dozen others ', ' have enormously increased their missionary efforts in Latin America. Just one example: on the language-school in Costa Rica to train missionaries in Spanish to work in all Latin American Spanish - speaking countries, there were recently 126 students. Of these only 14 belonged to the traditional denominations; 112 were members of the independent groups! » (p. 185).

« The independent sects have their own version of the Gospel which is opposed to any true ecumenical spirit. Each believes that it possesses the Holy Spirit, from whom it receives direct commands. There is no need at all for national councils of churches, and much less for a World Council. How different their attitude is from the prayer of our Lord in Chapter 12 of the Gospel of St. John! » (p. 185. 6).

The influence of these sects, judges Professor Moraes, ' will be a false Christian influence! ».

3. « Communism is also a religion; it may be a distorted religion, but still it is a religion. Some communist countries' violence and death came to other countries ... Communism has now many roots in Latin America. A large part of the population is poor, and provides an easy groud in which to sow the seeds of Marxism ». (p. 184).

4. The ' traditional churches ' are ' Protestant '. ' The Protestant Churches are the most aggressive forces in evangelism in Latin America, with the exception of the Lutheran Church (that is just beginning to carry on evangelistic work among people other than those of German descent), the traditional Protestant denom-

inations are so vigorous in their programme of evangelism that recent statistics prove that missions grow faster in Latin America than in any other part of the world! » (p. 185).

« Some traditional churches have reduced the number of their missionaries in Latin America, sending them to Africa and Asia ». Professor Moraes speaks of this in a regretful tone, since there is need in Latin America of ' a true biblical, ecumenical spirit '. (p. 186). He urges the start of ' a good source of regular information, without polemical character, both in Portuguese and in Spanish, in order to explain what ecumenism really means. For it is only through the inspiration of a good ecumenical spirit that the new Latin American generation will spread a sound influence throughout the world, taking everywhere the spirit of service, and never the despotic ideas of the Roman Catholic Church or of communism ». (p. 186).

Publication of statements of this kind about the Roman Catholic Church, made without the faintest shadow of evidence in justification, seem to me difficult to reconcile with the aims of a periodical like *The Ecumenical Review,* even granted that the editors say that ' the writers alone are responsible for the opinions expressed '. Frank speech is certainly not only admissible, but sometimes admirable; but generalities such as ' the despotical ideas of the Roman Latin Church or of Communism' seem to show rather an aggressive hostility than a Christian desire that the truth may appear. In view of such publication by so responsible an organ as *The Ecumenical Review,* how is it possible that we should not view with grave misgiving the proposals for integration of the World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council? How to avoid the inference that the World Council is to give greater countenance, if not positive support, to the ' Protestant Churches ' which ' are the most aggressive forces in evangelism in Latin America '? Ecumenists may perhaps answer that integration of the two bodies will in fact help towards irenic relations among all churches, and definitely tend against ' sub-Christian ' methods of evangelism; if this is so, it is much to be desired — that it be made unmistakably clear that integration will not in fact tend to give greater support to views about the Roman Catholic Church such as those expressed by Professor Moraes.

BERNARD LEEMING, S. J.

ECUMENISM AND REUNION

Queen of England Expresses Hope for Reunion to Lambeth Bishops

At the close of the Lambeth Conference in mid-August (details of which are discussed in the documentary section of this issue of *Unitas*) the Anglican Bishops in attendance were tendered a reception in Buckingham Palace and were addressed by Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth. In her reply to a discourse by Dr. Geoffrey Fisher, Archbishop of Canterbury, the Queen told the assembled Bishops that she hoped their meeting would hasten the end of the « unhappy divisions among Christians ». She noted that « real progress » towards reunion had been much in evidence since the 1948 Lambeth Conference.

« It is my earnest hope », declared the Queen, « that your present Conference may help to bring more healing to the unhappy divisions among Christians and so hasten the fulfillment of the Divine prayer ' that all may be one ' ».

The conference of Bishops at Lambeth did in fact devote a considerable amount of discussion to current schemes of unity involving the Anglican Communion. The chief among these were the plans of union framed in Pakistan, North India, and Ceylon, the latter of which was recommended as a model for future reunion schemes.

Not all that the Lambeth Report had to say on reunion matters proved convincing, however, and in Anglican circles misgivings were expressed at the lack of clarity with which pertinent issues were treated. Typical of the reserved acceptance of this part of the Report was the editorial comment in the *Church Times* for August 29. Referring to the reunion plans in progress in Pakistan, North India, and Ceylon, the editor of the Anglican weekly wrote:

« The relevant Resolution gives ' general endorsement ' to the verdict of the Committee on these schemes. This doubtless deliberate phaseology leaves room for uncertainty about which precise details of the schemes are *not* endorsed. We suggest that further questions must certainly be asked about at least two points. Baptism is essential to Church membership: yet the Committee points out that, at one place, the North India scheme talks about the un-

baptized as ' members '. This must be put right. Again, the Committee finds no difficulty in agreeing to alternatives to episcopal confirmation as perfectly satisfactory. Yet, by a Resolution in quite a different context, the Conference itself declares episcopal confirmation to be among the things ' essential to the safeguarding of our unity '. There is a contradiction here between one part of the Report and another which we trust will be resolved in defence of our Church's traditional insistence of confirmation as indeed a necessity.

« Two more details call for comment. The Conference has considered the fact that, under the schemes, visiting ministers, not episcopally ordained, will be free occasionally to celebrate the Eucharist in the united Churches. It is admitted that this a ' serious departure from Anglican practice ': yet the Conference holds that its occurrence (with a ' conscience clause ') need be no bar to full communion with the united Churches. This is a serious matter, which demands further clarification. So also is the declaration that the schemes are certainly entirely orthodox in faith when it is admitted by the Committee that they include, as continuing bases for instruction of Church members, the historic Confessions of the Reformed Faith (such as the Westminster Confession of the Presbyterians). If these are orthodox, whence come all ' our unhappy divisions '? ».

This section of the Lambeth Report on unity has been regarded in various quarters as disappointing; not only are many of the statements in it vague, and even ambiguous, but nothing really original is offered towards the achievement of unity, particularly so with regard to the Church of Rome.

* * *

Central Committee of World Council of Churches Meets in Denmark

The policy-making Central Committee of the World Council of Churches met for its annual sessions this past summer at Nyborg, Denmark from August 21 to 29. The deliberations of the Committee were opened by the annual report of the General Secretary of the World Council, Dr. W. A. Visser ' t Hooft who gave over the first part of his relation to an appraisal of the conversations of W. C. C. officials with representatives of the Patriarchate of Moscow held earlier in August at Utrecht. Dr. Visser ' t Hooft said that this contact with the Russian churchmen was valuable in that it could

eventually contribute to an effective *rapprochement* between the Christianity of the East and that of the West.

Another section of the General Secretary's report dealt with an over-all survey of the first ten years of the activity of the World Council of Churches since its foundation at Amsterdam in August 1948. « The setting of the Council », he said, « meant in fact that we chose an ecumenical movement which would not minimise the serious doctrinal issues of unity, but which would seek to work at these issues in the setting of the common calling of the churches to humanity. Thus, the unity we stand for was characterised as a pastoral unity — a unity, not merely for the sake of the Church, but for the sake of mankind ».

The principal purpose of the World Council, according to Dr. Visser ' t Hooft, is « increasingly to manifest the essential unity of the Church ». Nevertheless, he added, « we do not look upon the Council as a final solution of the problem of inter-church relations ».

Commenting on the number of member churches in the World Council, the General Secretary said that since its inception in 1948 twenty-three churches had joined the organization, bringing the membership to 170. Apropos of this, he remarked: « we should be even happier when we find that two or more member churces become united so that the number decreases. That is not happening as frequently as it ought. We have only four such cases on record during the period ».

During the interval of nine days in which it carried on its work, the Central Committee gave its consideration to the following topics: international affairs, inter-church aid, and service to refugees, ecumenical action, religious liberty, atomic warfare, and the Joint Statement issued by the representatives of the W. C. C. and the Moscow Patriarchate at the close of their meeting at Utrecht.

A further important subject discussed by members of the Committee was that of the current plan of amalgamating the World Council of Churches with the International Missionary Council. A report from the Joint Committee of the two bodies presided over by Dr. Henry P. Van Dusen indicated that the plan had solid support from member churches of the World Council. At its Ghana assembly in December 1957, the I. M. C. also approved the plan of union « in principle »; this has now been submitted to its member councils for their consideration.

At the session of the Central Committee given over to a discussion of the plan of integration, however, some misgivings were expressed as to the advisability of uniting the two world bodies. Pastor Charles Westphal of the French Reformed Church, for one, declared that this would make the interdenominational cooperation

now existing in France and in mission territories more difficult. He warned, too, that the resultant union might also « appear to our Orthodox and Roman Catholic brethren as a Protestant bloc against their tradition ».

Another dissenting voice was that of Metropolitan James of Melita who is both a member of the Central Committee and the representative of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople at the Geneva headquarters of the World Council. He said that the Orthodox have participated in the W. C. C. because it is a council of churches but that the plan in question involved such far-reaching changes that the attitude of the Orthodox would be severely strained.

« We find it difficult », declared the Metropolitan, « from our point of view to accept that the unity of the Church can be furthered by antagonistic missionary activity. We have already registered our position on this important point. We believe that the unity grows as the churches learn to love each other and march hand-in-hand towards the unifying Cross of the Lord ». (*EPS*).

* * *

Tenth Anniversary of World Council of Churches Celebrated

A solemn service was held in the Lutheran Cathedral of Odense in Denmark on August 24 in observance of the tenth anniversary of the foundation of the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam in 1948. To mark the occasion, two well-known leaders in the ecumenical field delivered addresses in which they urged humility and gratitude to Providence and renewed dedication to the ideal of unity. The speakers were the late George K. A. Bell, honorary president of the World Council, and Lutheran Bishop Otto Dibelius, one of the actual presidents of the Council.

Placing emphasis on what should be the real goal of the Ecumenical Movement, Bishop Bell said in part: « ... we shall not forget the necessity of working for such a visible unity of the whole Church of Christ as will not embrace only the Eastern Orthodox Church and other ancient churches, but also the Church of Rome. I am not now speaking of additions to the member churches but of the visible unity of the whole Church ». The speaker further called for a « spiritual witness of dedicated Christian lives » in support of the visible unity of the Church.

This, he said, « is no call for cloistered living or escape to an ivory tower but rather the reverse ... a more earnest effort after personal holiness so that men may see in our very being that God lives ».

Dr. Dibelius in his turn recalled the words he had used at the closing service of the First Assembly of the World Council at Amsterdam: ' The Holy Ghost was there ' and said that in looking back over the past ten years of Council activity he could think of nothing more appropriate than to use this same expression. Developing his point he said that « in the course of these ten years churches which formerly only knew of each other from hearsay have become friends. They have learned that they belong together because they belong to the same Lord Jesus Christ. We do not know how it will go on, but what has happened until now has happened in the Spirit of Jesus Christ — in spite of the mistakes we have made. He has interceded in our weakness. The Holy Ghost was there ». (*EPS*).

* * *

Dutch Bishops Name First Ecumenical Action Director

The Catholic Bishops of the Netherlands have recently established a special position for contact with Protestant and Orthodox Christians. This was announced in August by Archbishop Bernard J. Alfrink of Utrecht.

The Archbishop, acting on behalf of the Dutch Hierarchy, appointed Msgr. J. G. M. Willebrands as Episcopal Delegate for Ecumenical Action. Creation of the new post was understood to be in accordance with a recommendation from the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office, made on December 20, 1949, urging the bishops of the world to pay attention to contacts with non-Catholic Christians in their search for Christian unity.

In taking up his new duties, Msgr. Willebrands leaves the post of director of the philosophy department of the joint seminary of the Haarlem and Rotterdam dioceses. In recent years he has served as permanent secretary for the Catholic Conference on Ecumenical Problems, an international group which sponsors annual conferences on topics concerning Christian reunion. He is also president of the St. Willibrord Society, a Dutch Organization for the propagation of the Faith which takes a particular interest in ecumenical activities.

The creation of this new ecumenical action post follows ten years of meetings between Catholic priests and Protestant ministers in various localities in the Netherlands. (*NC*)

* * *

Christian-Jewish Center Is Planned for the Netherlands

A permanent international center for the study of Christian-Jewish relations is soon to be inaugurated in the Netherlands. The decision to realize this project was made at a conference on ways to develop a better understanding among Catholics of the importance of Judaism and to improve the attitude of Catholics towards Jews. The conference was arranged by Msgr. A. C. Ramselaar, president of the minor seminary of the Utrecht archdiocese. He is chairman of the Council of Israel, a Catholic organization which encourages contacts between Catholics and Jews and provides advice for Jews who are interested in Catholicism.

Participants in the sessions came from three continents. Included among them were Fr. John M. Oesterreicher, director of the Institute of Judaeo-Christian Studies at Seton Hall University; Abbot Leo Rudloff, O. S. B. of Dormition Abbey in Jerusalem, and Msgr. J. G. M. Willebrands, Episcopal Delegate for Ecumenical Action.

Father Oesterreicher, in an address entitled « The Old Testament is not Dead », cast doubt on the image of a vengeful God that is sometimes attributed to the Old Testament. Rather, he said, the Old Testament contains the joyful message of the Creation, and it speaks of God as the source of hope and mercy. Father Oesterreicher said further that the better Catholics realize that the Old Testament is the root of the New Testament, the better they will be able to practice their faith in Christ.

In the course of the conference, the participants were received by Archbishop Bernard J. Alfrink of Utrecht. (*The Pilot*)

* * *

Catholics and Protestants Discuss the Eucharist at German Abbey

Protestant and Catholic scholars spoke on the « The Eucharist and Holy Communion » during a day of retreat early in August at the Benedictine Abbey of Niederalteich. The director of the

program was Father Thomas Sartory, O. S. B. who is a member of the Abbey which has become a major center of Una Sancta, a movement aimed at promoting a better understanding between Protestants and Catholics in Germany.

Father Sartory sounded the keynote of the meeting by stressing the need to listen to the Word of God rather than engage in polemics, and the main emphasis of the program, accordingly, consisted primarily of a meditation period and liturgical services. Among the numerous participants from Germany and abroad was Father Avery Dulles, S. J., the son of the United States Secretary of State. (*NC*)

* * *

Episcopalian Leader Advocates Further Efforts for Unity

At the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church held in Miami Beach early in October, the presiding bishop of that body, the Rt. Reverend Henry Knox Sherrill affirmed that divisions of the Christian church « will hang separately unless they hang together ». This fact, he declared, is apparent to anyone « who will take off his rose-colored glasses and look at the world as it is today ».

In his address to the meeting of 450 ecumenical leaders of the Episcopal Church, Bishop Sherrill concluded: « We must look forward to the unity of all Christians throughout the world, including the Roman Catholic ». (*AP*)

* * *

Noted Ecumenist Deplores Denominational Divisiveness

At a conference of several hundred Congregationalists who met together at Hartford, Connecticut in July, Dr. Truman B. Douglass, executive vice-president of the Congregational Board of Home Missions in the USA, criticized the manifestation of Protestantism in local communities as « divisive and disruptive ». Dr. Douglass is prominent in American ecumenical circles and last year was chairman of the committee which drew up the message of the Faith and Order conference at Oberlin.

Addressing the delegates to the eighth assembly of the International Congregational Council, the noted churchman declared

that Protestant weakness was « due to the responsibility felt by every denomination to demonstrate some kind of distinctiveness ». Criticizing his co-religionists who followed this policy, he said: « We are not invited to be distinctive; and the more we try to be distinctive, the more we are likely to be merely eccentric or whimsical ».

Dr. Douglass pointed to various countries where Congregationalists already participating in more unions of Protestant tionalists have formed part of church unions in recent years and said that « with Congregationalists already participating in more unions of Protestant churches than any other denomination, we have irretrievably committed ourselves to lose ourselves denominationally in the enlarging and deepening unity of the people of Christ ». (*EPS*)

* * *

Lutherans Continuing Discussions with Church of South India

Lutherans in India are at present giving their attention to a recent statement from the Church of South India on the matter of the ministry and the episcopacy which was issued to obviate the difficulties encountered in previous discussions between the two religious bodies.

The new statement issued by the CSI theological commission declares that a system of bishops is needed « as episcopacy has been accepted in the Church from early times ». But, the commission goes on to say, the Church of South India « does not consider episcopal ordination essential for a valid ministry ». Then, without specifying in what sense the episcopacy is necessary, the statement affirms that « there cannot be a universally accepted ministry which does not include the historic episcopate as one element ».

Lutheran representatives had met for theological discussions with spokesmen from the CSI from 1947, when the Church of South India came into being, until two years ago when further conferences were suspended. The Lutheran body remains the only major Protestant group in India which has not taken part in the formation of the CSI. The latter now comprises groups once belonging to the Anglican, Methodist, Presbyterian, Congregational, and Reformed Churches. (*EPS*)

* * *

World Figure in Ecumenical Circles Dies at Canterbury

Dr. George K. A. Bell, former Anglican Bishop of Chichester, England, and honorary president of the World Council of Churches, passed away at Canterbury on October 3. Dr. Bell had been ill earlier this year, but as soon as his health improved sufficiently, he became active once again in his chosen field of ecumenical endeavor. He took an active part in the Lambeth Conference, and immediately afterwards traveled to Nyborg to participate in the meeting of the Central Committee of the World Council and to speak at the celebration commemorating the tenth anniversary of the Council.

On the day following the death of Dr. Bell, a statement was issued on behalf of the World Council by Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft in which the late Bishop was extolled as one of the pillars of the Ecumenical Movement. The text of the statement as given by the Ecumenical Press Service read in part: « Bishop George Bell, who had been Bishop of Chichester from 1929 till the beginning of this year, died yesterday at Canterbury at the age of 75. In him the ecumenical movement loses one of its great pioneers who gave consecrated and uninterrupted service to the cause of Christian cooperation and unity for nearly forty years.

« As chaplain to Archbishop Randall Davidson of Canterbury, he had been well prepared for his task. In 1925, when he was Dean of Canterbury, he took a leading part in the Stockholm Conference on Life and Work. Soon the Universal Christian Council for Life and Work made him its chairman. In that capacity he took far-reaching initiatives. He was one of the first to see the importance of the German Church conflict and gave strong spiritual backing to the Confessing Church in its struggle for Christian freedom over against national socialism ».

« Bishop Bell had taken a considerable part in the process of formation of the World Council of Churches. In 1948 he was chosen as the first chairman of its Central Committee — a post which he held till 1954 when he became the Council's honorary President, continuing, however, to attend its meetings and taking an active part in its life.

« He was equally concerned with the unity of the Church and with its task in the world. He presided over commissions on unity at two Lambeth Conferences, and published the four volumes of *Documents on Christian Unity*. But his war-time speeches carry

the significant title: « The Church and Humanity ». He was always ready to intervene for those who were persecuted or suffering from injustice.

« Bishop Bell's sermon in Odense Cathedral, Denmark, in August, on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the World Council of Churches, was his last public utterance. That sermon was on the text: ' We are unprofitable servants '.

« The World Council loses in him its most beloved leader who had done more than anyone to create that new spirit in and between the churches of which the World Council is the living embodiment ».

On his return from Athens in March of this year, Dr. Bell had visited Rome where he gave an illuminating lecture on the history of the Lambeth Conferences at the Foyer Unitas. During the course of his visit he was also received in audience by the late Pope Pius XII.

* * *

Unitas Secretary Dies in Paris

Fr. David Lathoud, of the Augustinians of the Assumption and secretary of the French edition of *Unitas*, was unexpectedly claimed by death on August 10. Father Lathoud had long been deeply interested in matters of reunion, and when the Unitas Association was founded in 1945, he gave generously of his time and effort in promoting its review in French. In late years he was likewise entrusted with the weekly program for unity on the Paris radio which sought to influence a wider public on the urgency of reunion.

With the passing of Father Lathoud, the Unitas Association has lost a valuable collaborator; and while its members pray for the eternal repose of his soul, they confidently hope that from his place in Heaven he will continue to help them in their endeavor, the greatness and difficulty of which he knew so well.

AROUND THE WORLD

World-wide Tributes Follow Death of Pope Pius XII

A long and eventful reign as head of the See of Peter in Rome came to an end on October 9 when death came quietly to Pope Pius XII, the spiritual leader of some 450,000,000 Catholics throughout the world. The late Pope, who was eighty-two, had reigned almost twenty years, having acceded to the papal throne on March 12, 1939, the date of his coronation.

By his own striking personality and qualities of leadership, Pope Pius brought the papacy to unprecedented heights, and the warm tributes to his greatness on all sides are witness to the immense influence for good that he exercised the world over. Catholics and non-Catholics alike have joined in expressing sorrow at the passing of this eminent and beloved leader from the world scene.

The pontificate of Pope Pius was outstanding for many things. Apart from his numerous acts directly affecting the right ordering of the Catholic Church, his many other activities and statements won the respect and attention of the civilized world. His efforts for reconciliation during the difficult war years and their aftermath gained him the title of « the Pope of peace ». His range of interests was well-nigh universal, and in his copious pronouncements over the years he constantly sought to apply the timeless principles of Christianity to all the legitimate fields of human endeavor. His sollicitude did not limit itself only to those of the Catholic Church, but often went beyond to their separated brethren. He appealed more than once for the unity of Christians, and in his annual Christmas messages he regularly called upon all men of good will to work for the creation of a better world and a closely unified human family. Justly, then, did one of the epitaphs proclaim in his memory on the day of his interment: « With his passing a great light has been spent on earth ... ».

One of the many tributes paid to Pope Pius by those not belonging to the Church of Rome is to be found in the Anglican *Church Times* for October 10 from which we should like to quote at length:

« The reign of Pope Pius XII was marked by a number of developments of great interest to all Christians, and not merely to those of his own obedience. His personal interests and output were immense, and it would be impossible in a short space to give any idea of their scope.

« First of all tribute must be paid to his outstanding character and personality, which struck all who had close contact with him, whatever their background. All who had the privilege of audience with him were unanimous in their witness. He had a presence which immediately made itself felt by those who saw and heard him, and he always left the clear impress of one who was a holy and humble man of heart.

« The interests of Pope Pius XII were much affected by the very wide experience which he had of other nations and Churches before he became Pope. He never ceased to give attention to relations with other Christians. This was shown earlier this year when the late Bishop George Bell called on him and discussed privately with him in a most sympathetic atmosphere the problems of greater unity within Christendom.

« During the Pontificate of Pope Pius XII a number of events occurred which brought Christians of the Roman obedience and other Christians closer together. It would not be too much to say that during the past fifteen years there has been a distinct change for the better in these relationships, and a much greater readiness on both sides for Christians to regard each other, though divided, as separated brethren rather than as warring enemies.

« For this development, which must be a cause of thankfulness to all Christians, the late Pope was in considerable measure responsible. The tone of many of his statements and encyclicals encouraged unity and co-operation in practical matters between Roman Catholics and other Christians. Not infrequently he appealed to Christians as a whole and did not confine his letters only to Roman Catholics. He was particularly anxious for common work in the interests of a just order in social, national, and international affairs.

« In June 1945, an organization called *Unitas* was set up in Rome for the purpose of drawing Roman Catholics and other Christians closer together. On that occasion the Vatican Radio said: ' The Church has never resigned herself to the permanence of the wounds which have been made in her unity. Her Doctors, Councils, Saints, and most of all, her Roman Pontiffs, have spared no effort to re-establish spiritual unity. One hears still in one's ears echoes of the recent appeals of Benedict XV and Pope Pius XI and those of the Pope now reigning, inviting all men of good will

to collaboration ». It is known that this was not merely the public attitude of the Pope, but did in fact represent a permanent and deep interest. He was kept fully informed of developments in this field ».

« There were », concludes the Anglican newspaper, « many subjects of international order and justice in which the Pope spoke for Christendom at large in words which thinking Christians everywhere were happy to endorse. His reign has been one of important development, and all Christians may thank God for his witness in such matters as these, and pray for God's guidance in the choice of a successor, for even in our divisions we are inevitably united as we claim to serve the same Lord and kneel before the same Redeemer ».

* * *

FRANCE

Late Pope Addresses Mariological Congress at Lourdes

Speaking in French by radio from the study of his summer residence at Castelgandolfo, the late Pope Pius XII addressed words of appreciation and encouragement to those attending the Mariological Congress at Lourdes during the latter part of September. He spoke of Our Lady and her apparitions at Lourdes, often in the form of a direct prayer to the Mother of God. He called the 'Hail Mary' « the greeting of the angel which the whole of humanity offers incessantly through the centuries like a flower at the altar of the Sovereign ». The Pope recalled his own visit to Lourdes before he was elected to the papacy and called it « that happy hour when We also had the opportunity of lifting Our eyes toward the White Lady of the Pyrenees and praying the 'Ave Maria' ». He said further that the Mariological Congress was undoubtedly the most solemn observance of the Lourdes centenary year and thanked French officials for the warm welcome given to the papal legate to the congress, His Eminence, Eugene Cardinal Tisserant.

Enlarging on his theme, the Pope declared that it was at Lourdes that Our Lady chose to teach men the two essential means by which perfect happiness is attained: « assiduous and confident prayer and the indispensable Christian mortification which sustains it ». Stating that for the past hundred years Our Lady has demonstrated at Lourdes her tenderness, mercy, and love for man,

the Pope said that he wished to proclaim « Our certainty that the restoration of the reign of Christ through Mary cannot fail to be achieved, since it is impossible that such a seed, sown so abundantly, should not bear rich fruit ».

Towards the end of his address, the Pope appealed to the theologians gathered at Lourdes to « implore for the world all the gifts you deem necessary and opportune, each one according to the needs he is aware of. But pray above all that hatred and discord may cease, that the insolent voices of covetousness and pride be reduced to silence, and that the joyous and salutary sun of the so much hoped for peace may finally shine on the earth ... Invoke with your prayers the reign of Christ to which you are invited by your most loving Mother and for which her maternal intercession constantly procures all the means necessary to you ». (*NC*)

* * *

ENGLAND

English Bishops Announce Plan to Set up New Catholic Institute of Studies

The Catholic Bishops of England and Wales have recently proposed the founding of an Institute of higher studies to grant degrees in philosophy and theology. This announcement was made at the close of a four-day conference on Catholic higher studies at St. Mary's Training College for Teachers near London. Up to the present, English priests and seminarians have had to take their degrees in philosophy and theology from secular or foreign universities. As yet no site for the prospective institute has been chosen.

The idea of the institute was advanced by the Bishops' action committee for schools. Following further deliberation, the conference passed a resolution that the institute « be established as quickly as possible ». The resolution stated that the proposed school should eventually be extended to offer other subjects of concern to Catholics and suggested that the higher studies center be made a « clearing house for information concerning research being undertaken by scholars in this country and for contact among them ».

The doctorates granted by the institute would be the first conferred by a Catholic institution of learning in Britain since the Reformation. (*The Pilot*)

Memorial to Monsignor Ronald Knox to be Erected at Oxford

A memorial to Msgr. Ronald Knox, the noted Roman Catholic scholar and writer, is to be established at Trinity College, Oxford, by the endowment of a prize or scholarship connected with Biblical or classical studies.

Monsignor Knox, who died in August of last year, was closely connected with Trinity College for many years. The memorial will commemorate his life and work and will be interdenominational in view of the fact that Monsignor Knox numbered many non-Catholics among his friends.

In June an appeal was published in London for funds for the memorial and for the purchase of a bust of the late scholar for the college. Among the signers of the appeal were Prime Minister Harold Macmillan; the Earl of Norfolk, Britain's premier earl and a Catholic; the Rev. Eric Hamilton, Anglican dean of Windsor, who is domestic chaplain to Queen Elizabeth II; the Earl of Oxford and Asquith; Evelyn Waugh and C. S. Lewis. (*N. Y. Times*)

* * *

BELGIUM

Vatican Letter to Canon Law Congress Stresses Value of Systematized Knowledge of the Past

While the Church looks forward to the future, it cannot disregard the « wealth of wisdom and experience » she has accumulated in the past. This was a point made in a message of congratulations sent on behalf of the late Pope Pius XII to Dr. Stephan Kuttner, professor of canon law at the Catholic University of America on the occasion of the international congress on medieval canon law held at Louvain, Belgium, late in July. The letter was written in the name of the Holy Father by Msgr. Angelo Dell'Acqua, substitute Vatican Secretary of State.

The message to Dr. Kuttner, who presided over the congress, said that « as you are aware, the Church, through her apostolic mission, looks toward the future ... but strengthened by her centuries-old traditions she cannot disregard the wealth of wisdom and experience contained in the history of her institutions and laws.

« Encouraging research like yours », it continued, « the Church in fact surpasses the noble perspectives of simple scholarship and rejoices in enriching the treasure of her past to the advantage of the new tasks constantly confronting her ».

The international congress was convoked by the Institute of Research and Study in Medieval Canon Law, whose center is at the Catholic University of America in Washington. The institute was founded by Dr. Kuttner and has as its chief purpose the publication of many inaccessible manuscripts which pertain to research in ecclesiastical law. (*Doc. Catholique*)

* * *

GERMANY

Katholikentag in Berlin Draws Many Thousands from East and West Sectors

It has been estimated that over a hundred thousand Catholics from both areas of divided Germany — about seventy thousand of these from the Eastern zone — participated in the seventy-eighth biennial *Katholikentag* which took place in Berlin in mid-August. With permission from the East Germany authorities, special trains were arranged for those attending the celebration from that area, while free access to Berlin was also granted to those coming by train from West Germany. The authorities of the Democratic German Republic likewise allowed large and well-attended functions to take place contemporaneously in both East and West Berlin.

On the opening night of the *Katholikentag* some 20,000 visitors from West Germany attended a meeting in the Western sector of the city, while an estimated 50.000 attended an other meeting in the Werner Seelenbinder Hall in the Eastern sector. Both assemblies were addressed by the President of the Central Committee of German Catholics, Prince Karl zu Löwenstein, who spoke on the theme of the *Katholikentag*: « Our concern is man; our salvation is the Lord ». Among the speakers at both meetings was also a representative of the German Lutherans, Graf von Bismarck, who assured his listeners that his fellow Lutherans were at one with Catholics in carrying out their common Christian responsibilities. (*The Tablet*).

* * *

HUNGARY

Ruins from Early Christian Times Discovered by Workmen

Remains dating from early Christian times were discovered by workmen restoring a cathedral in Hungary, according to a Budapest news agency report received in Vienna. While the workmen were reinforcing the foundation of the medieval cathedral of Pecs, they uncovered the remains of a building with painted walls, a Roman tombstone, and a stone-lined grave containing objects dating from the early Christian era.

Pecs was one of the earliest Christian centers in Hungary. It was known for many centuries as the « City of Five Churches », a name by which it is still called in Germany, France, and Italy. (*NC*)

* * *

THE UNITED STATES

Statistics on American Church Membership

Sixty-one per cent of all Americans, who number 180,500,000, were church members in 1957, according to figures contained in the *1959 Yearbook of American Churches,* an annual publication sponsored by the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U. S. A.

The latest statistics compiled by the Council reveal that church members in the United States reached 104,189,678 during 1957, an increase of 964,724 over the previous year. However, for the first time since World War II, the percentage of increase in church membership, nine-tenths of one per cent, dropped below the rate of increase for the total population which was 1.7 per cent.

In 1956 an estimated 62 per cent of all Americans were church-goers, and the increase in church membership was then 3 per cent, almost double the increase in population.

The *Yearbook of American Churches* lists 267 religious bodies in the United States, 255 of which provided statistics for the publication. The largest religious groups, and their 1957 memberships, are listed by the *Yearbook* as being: Protestants, 59,823,777; Ca-

tholics, 35,846,477; Jews, 5,500,000; Eastern Orthodox, 2,540,446; and Old Catholics and Polish National Catholics, 273,692.

The largest single Protestant group is the Methodist Church with 9,543,245 adherents; while Baptists, with about 20 million members, in 27 different branches, make up the largest Protestant « family grouping ».

* * *

INDIA

Holy See Permits Further Use of Vernacular

In a recent decree, the Holy See has granted permission for an extended use of the vernacular in the metropolitan province of Agra, India, which includes the archdiocese and six suffragan dioceses, all of the Latin rite. Thus, it will be permissible to use Hindu, Urdu, Bengali, Gujerati, and several dialects of Hindustani. Vernacular versions of the Epistle and Gospel may be read immediately after the Latin, by a layman at Low Mass or by the subdeacon and deacon at High Mass. The decision of the Holy See also permits the use of the vernacular in all scriptural readings in the liturgy of Holy Thursday, Good Friday, and the Easter Vigil, the sole exception being that the Passion is to be sung in Latin on Good Friday. (*The Tablet*).

BOOK REVIEWS

ERIC L. MASCALL, *Lambeth 1958 and Christian Unity* (Published by The Council for The Defence of Church Principles) London, the Faith Press, 1958.

Few contemporary Anglican theologians or philosophers command a more respectful hearing in Catholic circles than Dr. Eric Mascall of Christ Church, Oxford. The list of his books is impressive; his mind is acute and penetrating, and the brilliance of his wit is the delight of all who are privileged to know him. His writings are more intelligible to Catholics than are those of many of his fellow-Anglicans, particularly on matters relating to Christian unity, because he abhors loose and woolly thinking, and understands and uses our precise theological terms. This can be disconcerting to some ecumenicists.

And one of Dr. Mascall's many interests is the reunion of Christendom, particularly of course where his own communion is concerned. Some twelve years ago he wrote a pamphlet *Priesthood and South India* which was sharply critical of the validity, from the Anglican standpoint, of the orders of the Church of South India as the scheme for reunion was then envisaged. After quotations from the proposed Constitutions of that Church, he wrote: « For the South India scheme the restriction of the celebration of the Eucharist to an ordained minister ... is only a matter of convenience. Still clearer is it that the minister need not have received ordination from a Bishop » — a position which he contrasted with the categorical reply of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to Pope Leo XIII that the Eucharist may be consecrated only by « properly ordained priests, and by no other ministers of the Church ». And again: « It is extremely difficult to understand how anyone who believed episcopacy to be of divine appointment and episcopal ordination to be an essential guarantee of the sacraments of the Church could tolerate a position in which the Church to which he belonged had no particular interpretation of episcopacy, nor does the adoption of episcopacy without any interpretation of it appear to be logically possible ». Accordingly he concluded that: « The Church of England cannot speak with

one voice to Rome and another to the Protestants of South India. If the South Indian scheme has convinced Anglicans of its own inacceptability it will at least have taught us the lesson of waiting upon God ».

Hence to some of his friends, particularly the die-hard Anglo-Catholics of the « Annunciation Group », his apparent *volte face* after the Convocations accepted South Indian orders as valid came as a shock and a disappointment. Dr. Mascall's views on the necessary minimum of intention required for the validity of orders appear in the mean time to have been somewhat modified in a minimist direction. In his pamphlet *The Convocations and South India* (1) he vigorously defended South Indian orders. He said of the Convocations' decisions that « by some they have been received with relief and joy as a resolute affirmation of the fundamental Catholicity of the Church of England; by others they have been received with dismay and even despair as a virtual abandonment by the Church of England of any claims to Catholicism. If I incline to the former of these positions, it is not with any desire to make the best of a bad job or, on the other hand, in the belief that we can afford to rest on our laurels, but because I believe that a careful consideration of all the facts of the case shows that position to be correct ».

Despite Dr. Mascall's joy over their orders he remained somewhat critical of other aspects of the South Indian scheme, and hoped it would not be repeated elsewhere. These misgivings were re-iterated in a reply to Fr. A. A. Stephenson, S. J. (2) in which he wrote: « The Church of South India declares that it ' accepts and will maintain the historic episcopate ' and that ' continuity with the historic episcopate will be effectively maintained '. Both of them [the Church of England and the Church of South India] go into a good deal of detail about what bishops, presbyters, and deacons are and do. I believe that the Church of South India is in many ways a gravely defective body, and Fr. Stephenson believes the same about the Church of England. But I do not see how on any sound principle the validity of the orders of either can be denied ».

This is a long way from the logical impossibility of « episcopacy without any interpretation of it » of Dr. Mascall's earlier pamphlet. But his « relief and joy » over South Indian orders after their recognition by the Convocations did a great deal to reassure wavering Anglicans of 1955 that South India was « all right » because Dr. Mascall seemed to think so.

---

(1) Mowbrays, London, 1955.

(2) Published in *Anglican Orders*, by Anthony A. Stephenson, S. J. Burns & Oates, London, 1956, pp. 50-57.

But now, three years later, Dr. Mascall appears to be profoundly disturbed. Since the Lambeth Conference of last summer he has produced another pamphlet *Lambeth 1958 and Christian Unity* which is severely critical of the Lambeth attitude not only of unstinting praise for the Church of South India but of its uncritical encouragement of the further reunion schemes in Ceylon and in North India and Pakistan ([3]). He does not, of course, withdraw anything he wrote earlier about South Indian orders, and he considers that the highly controversial new ordinal which that body has drawn up since Anglican recognition is still capable of conferring valid orders. But his criticisms of the ecumenical resolutions of the Lambeth Conference are so penetrating that, in view of the great publicity which that Conference has received, they are deserving of consideration.

Apart from the question of their new ordinal, which he thinks Lambeth should at least have shown signs of having noted, Dr. Mascall's main criticisms of the Lambeth attitude to South India (which he terms an « unrestrained panegyric ») is that no reference whatsoever was made to the fact that all the six points on which the Derby Report considered that some modification would be essential if full communion was to be achieved with the C. S. I. have apparently been ignored by that body. And again, the fact had been explicitly laid before the Lambeth Committee that the use of unfermented grape juice in C. S. I. eucharists is a common practice. The Bishop of Exeter, Dr. Mortimer, (who of course was present at Lambeth) had written in the *Church Times* (October 4, 1957) expressing « concern for the Ecumenical Movement if the Church of England, unlike the rest of Western Christendom, did not regard the fermented juice of the grape as part of the essential matter of the Eucharist ». Yet the matter is not so much as mentioned in the Lambeth Report.

As regards reunion proposals in Ceylon and North India, Dr. Mascall is even more scathing. These proposals are two in number, the *Scheme of Church Union in Ceylon* (Lanka) and the *Plan of Church Union in North India and Pakistan.* Neither of these is considered doctrinally satisfactory from the Anglo-Catholic point of view. The twelve articles of faith of the *Plan* « refrains from any suggestion that Christ is received in the Lord's Supper and explicitly declares that ' the benefits of the Sacraments are not from any virtue in them, or in him that doth administer them, but only from the blessing of Christ and the working of the Holy Spirit in them that by faith receive them ' ». Dr. Mascall then com-

---

([3]) *The Lambeth Conference 1958: The Encyclical Letter from the Bishops together with the Resolutions and Reports.* S. P. C. K., London, 1958.

ments on the astonishing inconsistency of the *Plan* in admitting as systems of doctrine in the Church the sometimes mutually contradictory Westminster Confession, the Confession and Canons of the Synod of Dort, the Heidelberg Catechism, Luther's Catechism, and the Augsburg Confession. But what has given him a « greater moral shock than anything else in the Lambeth Conference Report » is the naked admission that this policy was adopted « to secure the legal continuity of the united Church ... and for the safeguarding of property ». This invites a comparison: can one imagine a Pope in the days of the undivided Church when purity of faith really mattered saying to a reconciled Arian bishop « But of course you may continue to make an outward profession of Arianism if it will help to safeguard your episcopal palace and revenues »? Or as Dr Mascall puts it, « If it is accepted as a legitimate principle we shall never be able to place reliance on the doctrinal affirmations of any religious body: it will always be open to it to say ' Of course we don't really believe this, but we have to go on asserting it in order to keep our property '. I think the ordinary men and women to whom Dr. Fisher tells us the report is primarily directed will feel that a body ought no longer to keep its property if it no longer holds the doctrines for whose propagation it acquired it ».

Both in Ceylon and in North India and Pakistan the ministries are to be « unified » immediately, in the hopes of avoiding some of the more controversial elements in the South India scheme. Dr. Mascall devotes considerable space to the consideration of these unification ceremonies, in which Anglican and Nonconformist are alleged each to enter fully into the other's heritage, thereby securing the episcopal succession, and comes to the conclusion that the *Scheme* would probably confer valid orders, but the *Plan* is very doubtful — in any case he is « gravely doubtful of the whole procedure ... many Anglicans are gravely doubtful whether the Catholic ministry can be conferred by anything other than the regular rite of ordination by a bishop and that the whole notion of unification ceremonies is novel and precarious ». But what worries him most is the almost dishonest ambiguity with which words are interpreted to Anglicans and to Nonconformists. There has been an explicit assertion on the one hand to the latter that the service is « not re-ordination ». Anglicans have hazzardously interpreted this as meaning « not re-ordination, but ordination » (i. e. *ab initio*), and have so calmed their consciences. But, says Dr. Mascall, « at a Conference in India in August 1957 Archdeacon Sully declared that such an interpretation was ' explicitly excluded ' and although he was not speaking officially, there can be little

doubt that the readiness of non-Anglicans in India to proceed with the *Plan* was largely due to this assurance ».

The Lambeth Committee certainly made a few hesitant reservations and expressed many hopes. It *hoped* that the word « sprinkling » in baptism would be taken to imply that the water must actually flow over the candidate. It *hoped* that Confirmation would become general, and that the *Plan* would restrict the use of the word « member » to the baptised. It *hoped* that the Church of North India and Pakistan would not re-ordain a minister who returns to work after having retired. And it deprecated the ordination of women, and only in this last case does it suggest that a rejection of its recommendations would jeopardise its relations with the Anglican Communion.

The Lambeth Conference, however, advised the Anglican Churches to enter into full communion with the Church of Ceylon immediately on its inauguration, and the Committee made what in view of the objections pointed out by Dr. Mascall the truly astonishing assertion that « The Doctrinal Statements of both the *Scheme* (Ceylon) and the *Plan* (North India and Pakistan) are unexceptionable. No Anglican need entertain any doubt concerning the orthodoxy of the Faith of the resulting Churches ». Has « orthodoxy » lost all meaning to the Anglican episcopate?

Dr. Mascall concludes with a most refreshing plea for a greater precision in theological terms, and this indeed lies at the very heart of the matter. Ecumenical jargon has substituted « varying spiritual insights » for conflicting and heretical dogmas, and even the word « unity » can sometimes mean no more than friendliness and mutual co-operation. Dr. Mascall objects to the « painstaking construction of statements, formulas, and rites that are deliberately meant to be ambiguous » as well as the « substitution of vague terms of non-theological provenance for the precise terms of traditional theology ». He lists « enter into the spiritual heritage », « true parts of the Church », providing a « link » with the historic episcopate, and « spiritual effectiveness of ministerial orders » as phrases that have « no recognised theological connotation and can therefore be interpreted by different people in different ways ». But do Anglicans realise how completely this policy differentiates them from the « undivided Church » to which they so constantly appeal? The primitive Church in her General Councils and statements of faith made every possible effort to achieve precise definitions of exactly what she meant, and the elimination of all possible misunderstandings, to the exclusion of those who refused to accept. But Anglicanism and the Protestant bodies to which she seeks union on the mission field seek to make their formularies

as vague and ambiguous as possible, so that no one need be excluded who can accept a bare minimum.

Dr. Mascall does not draw this contrast, but he concludes with a magnificent appeal for precision which the whole Ecumenical Movement might well take to heart if true unity is to be achieved: « What is at stake is something wider than any matter of ecclesiastical policy; it is nothing less than the function of human speech as the medium for the communication of truth. God has given us the power of speech and the gift of language in order that we shall be able to apprehend the truth ourselves and communicate it to others. The function of discourse is to clarify, not to confuse our thought; *distinguer pour unir,* not *confondre pour mélanger.* We are all of us today vividly aware of the violence to intellectual integrity that has taken place in the totalitarian states through the assumption that the purpose of language is not primarily to express the truth but to produce desired results; we can easily overlook the fact that ' double-think ' has seriously invaded the realm of Christian life and in particular the area of reunion movements. I do not see how any man can engage for very long in the task of devising ambiguous forms of words without blunting his sense of the awful claims of truth ».

« I do not think we need despair », writes our author with some apparent hesitation, in summing up these aspects of the Lambeth Report. But if it has so profoundly disturbed a scholar of his status, it is clear that as time goes on the *malaise* in Anglo-Catholic circles will spread. And indeed there is other evidence of considerable unrest. But in spite of the hue and cry in extremist circles no dramatic developments are to be expected. Past crises in the Church of England have shown that only a tiny minority of Anglicans reach the logical conclusion of their misgivings on the catholicity of their Church.

WALTON HANNAH

ALBERT C. OUTLER, *The Christian Tradition and the Unity We Seek.* Oxford University Press 1958. xii + 165 pages. Price in the U. K. 12/6.

There is a note of urgency throughout this book. Professor Outler is of the opinion that the World Council of Churches, of which he is a firm and convinced supporter, has come to a critical point in its development. If it cannot pass beyond, it will, he believes, fail in its ultimate purpose and be just one more of the abortive attempts that, after a promising start, tailed off into inef-

fectiveness. So in these lectures he is delivering a message — to rouse interest, enthusiasm and endeavour outside of the relatively narrow circle of present-day ecumenists. Unless the movement becomes more general, he thinks it is doomed.

One may not doubt his earnest sincerity, though his involved and, one might almost say, pretentious style goes some way to disguising it. For though he does in places speak simply, and then he is far more forceful, usually he ties up his meaning in long words and complicated sentences, where one can with difficulty distinguish any ' single determinant of propositional truth '.

He starts by trying to bring home to his hearers (for this book is the text of his Richard Lectures delivered at the University of Virginia) that the World Council of Churches is an existing organization with a firmly established life. That means that a very large number of Churches have met together and, while admitting differences, have realised that they have much in common, and encouraged by this, intend to remain together. While the different bodies have different histories, they all have the same roots and so a deal of history in common. The common history is unitive; the particular histories, divisive. The common history, then, should be studied and cherished and the particular histories viewed in its light. The great unitive factor in the early Church was the sense of community. As that was lost, division gained ground. Looked at from another point of view, what divides the Churches is their various traditions; what unites them is the *traditum*. The World Council of Churches has restored, at least in some measure, the fact of community. That must be retained and, without forcing the pace too much, developed.

There is a great deal in the book with which I do not agree. It abounds in challenging phrases, some meant by the author to be challenging, others not. There are also, it seems to me, some doubtful history and some loose thinking. For instance, in the chapter on ' The Christian Tradition ', nowhere is it made clear what the A. means by tradition. In current usage it can have at least three meanings — the message of Christ delivered to His Apostles and particularly that part of it that is not contained in the N. T.; it can mean the consensus of opinion of the Latin and the Greek Fathers; or it can mean the customs, devotions, attitudes that have developed in the history of the (or a) Church. The A. uses it in all these three senses indiscriminately, and as if they were more or less the same thing: (Councils and creeds) « appeal beyond themselves *to the Scripture* AND *the tradition*. Their authority ... But this is the authority of *any* doctrine, *any* creed, *any* liturgy, *any* tradition » (pp. 124-5; Capitals and italics are the Author's). « The only con-

structive answer is to measure *all* the various traditions of any and every church by the single Christian tradition » (p. 126), and later on the same page it seems to mean the act of *tradere*. What the A. is driving at is that, to assess the authenticity of the modern Churches, their doctrine should be compared with the doctrine of the primitive Church, or rather one should ask: « Do they re-present Christ? ». They all claim so to do and they all do to some extent. But their different re-presentations depend largely on their diverse interpretations of the N. T. And unless there is an authoritative, and so certain, interpretation, who is to decide which re-presentation is the closer and the more authentic. The A. deduces that, because there is a plurality of traditions, i. e. because there are differences between the Churches, therefore all must be at variance with the original tradition. No. It is still logically possible that all but one should be at variance with the original tradition, and that is precisely what the Catholic Church says. Unity of Churches, real unity, will come only with allegiance to the original tradition. In that the A. is quite right. If that original tradition exists as a fact today, unity will be adherence to the community that preserves and embodies it.

But Professor Outler, though he would doubtless admit the principle just enunciated, will not accept the implication. So he does well to support and promote the World Council of Churches, and the more he can do to keep it to its true purpose, of fostering unity among the Churches, the better, for it seems to be in danger of becoming a force of disunity, by letting itself be too closely tied to the sectarian, missionary activities of some of its members.

J. Gill, S. J.

THE UNITAS ASSOCIATION

is an international organization whose purpose it is to promote the spiritual union of men and especially of Christians. It was founded in Rome in 1945 by a group of professors and writers, priests and laymen; and in June of that year received the blessing of Pope Pius XII. Fr. Charles Boyer, S. J., Dean of the Theological Faculty of the Gregorian University in Rome, was elected president of the Association and also serves as editor of its organ Unitas *which appears in three editions: English, French, and Italian.*

Established at the center of Catholicity, the Unitas Association in carrying on its activities endeavours to follow with studied perfection the guidance of the Holy See. In striving to fulfill its purpose, it attempts to regulate its mission in accordance with the following principles:

To Catholics it recalls the benefits of the unity which they enjoy and the duty which is incumbent upon them to pray for those who are deprived of it. The Association invites the active co-operation of Catholics and exhorts them to keep ever before them the advice of Pope Pius XI: « This unity ought to be promoted less by discussion or other means than by the example of a saintly life ».

To its separated brethren of the Eastern Churches, it speaks of those long glorious centuries of union when the Doctors of the East illumined the universal Church and triumphed with their Latin brethren over the most subtle and distressing heresies. Unitas lays stress upon all that the separated East has preserved in common with Catholics: the priesthood, the Sacraments, the cult of the Blessed Virgin Mary. It makes clear the duty of union and strives to eliminate the barriers which prejudice and resentment have in the course of the centuries erected between Christians of the East and West.

To Anglicans and Protestants, Unitas reveals the genuine character of the Roman Catholic Church. Across the imperfections of men, it tries to make evident that spirit of fraternal affection and faithfulness to the teachings of Christ which is at the very heart of the Church's life and the manifestation of the Holy Spirit at work in her. Finally, Unitas keeps in close touch with the Ecumenical Movement, and endeavours to aid it in its quest for unity.

* * *

The Unitas Association has affiliated groups in Italy, France, Belgium, Canada, and Turkey. All that is necessary to form a group of this kind to further the aim of Christian unity is that a small number of persons of good will plan their organization, obtain the approval of their bishop, and then make their step known to the Central Committee of the Association in Rome.